

13

THE STORY OF EDWARD HINES

WHO IS FALSELY ACCUSED OF HAVING SECURED
BY BRIBERY THE ELECTION OF WILLIAM
LORIMER TO THE SENATE OF THE
UNITED STATES



A DISCUSSION OF THE TESTIMONY GIVEN AT
VARIOUS TIMES BY CLARENCE S. FUNK AND
OTHERS, AS DERIVED FROM THE
OFFICIAL RECORDS



BY FREDERICK UPHAM ADAMS

THE STORY OF EDWARD HINES

WHO IS FALSELY ACCUSED OF HAVING SECURED
BY BRIBERY THE ELECTION OF WILLIAM
LORIMER TO THE SENATE OF THE
UNITED STATES



A DISCUSSION OF THE REMARKABLE TESTIMONY
GIVEN AT VARIOUS TIMES BY CLARENCE
S. FUNK, AS DERIVED FROM THE
OFFICIAL RECORDS



BY FREDERICK UPHAM ADAMS

INTRODUCTION

For months certain influential Chicago newspapers have conducted a publicity campaign intended to prejudice the members of the United States Senate against Senator William Lorimer. It is charged that he secured his election through the bribery of members of the Illinois Legislature.

It is also charged that Mr. Edward Hines, a Chicago lumberman, stated to Mr. Clarence S. Funk, General Manager of the International Harvester Company, that he (Hines) had been instrumental in raising a fund of \$100,000 with which to "put Lorimer over." Mr. Hines has denied under oath that he ever made any such statement, and has submitted proof of a most convincing nature in substantiation of his emphatic denial.

Under the initiative of the Chicago Tribune and its allies the press of the United States has been induced to give almost unlimited space to every charge and to every absurd and malicious rumor reflecting on Edward Hines. No palpable lie has been too grotesque to obtain wide circulation. The prejudiced statements of prejudiced witnesses have been accepted as facts. Bitter editorials against Mr. Hines have been reinforced by cartoons depicting him as the capitalistic corrupter of state legislatures, and the paragraphers have dubbed him the "Maker of Senators."

Years of newspaper training have taught me not to condemn anybody on newspaper evidence, but the press denunciation of Edward Hines was so general that I gradually came to accept his complicity in the alleged corrupt election of Senator Lorimer as a matter of course. Not a hint of evidence in his favor appeared in the press dispatches. Day after day, week after week, month after month the charges piled up against him, with not a line to indicate that there was another side to the story.

I have spent months in a careful study of the written evidence which has been given under oath in the Lorimer investigations.

I declare without hesitation that this evidence absolutely establishes the complete innocence of Edward Hines.

It also proves that he has been made the victim of a most atrocious conspiracy—a conspiracy which disgraces American journalism and which sounds a warning which must be heeded.

Enraged that the United States Senate declined to accept as true the original charges against William Lorimer, rendered desperate because of the vote in his favor, certain conspirators grasped a bit of unfounded gossip, magnified it into a high political and moral crime, and supported this invention by the most astounding foundation of misrepresentation, evasion, duplicity and open perjury ever displayed in the political history of the United States.

To defeat William Lorimer these conspirators have not hesitated to attempt to wreck the reputation of Edward Hines. To win a partisan fight they have not hesitated to try to bring disgrace on Edward Hines and his family, to humiliate his friends and to drag an honorable business standing in the mire.

Let it not be assumed that the press of the United States willingly or wittingly lent itself to this miserable crusade. The newspapers outside of Chicago printed what was sent to them. This consisted of the charges and the rumors against Edward Hines. Every charge against him was printed and reprinted; every bit of sworn evidence in his favor was minimized or totally suppressed.

The insatiate demand of the public for sensational news played into the hands of the conspirators. Correspondents and editors are trained to cater to the craving of the public for the abnormal. There is no news so precious as a crime—the greater the crime the better, the more prolonged its developments the better. Therefore it is an attractive bit of news to quote some witness—irresponsible or perjured—who asserts that a Chicago millionaire collected \$100,000 and with it bribed a legislature to elect a Senator. The editors of sensa-

tional papers await with eagerness any alleged proof in support of the original charge. It keeps alive the sensation. It meets the demands of a certain class of their readers. It does not serve the purpose of these moulders of public opinion to admit that new evidence proves that the same millionaire did not spend \$100,000 in bribing a legislature.

An entertaining lie will travel a thousand miles—a dull truth in rebuttal will not penetrate the walls of the room in which it is uttered.

The testimony given under oath unquestionably establishes the innocence of Edward Hines. I state most emphatically that not one line of unimpeached evidence has been produced which warrants even a suspicion that Mr. Hines was corruptly concerned in the election of Senator Lorimer. I assert that the facts prove that he had no sane or understandable motive for the acts charged against him.

I have in preparation a book which will expose in detail the successive steps of the conspiracy against Edward Hines. The following pages touch on only a few of the scores of details of this remarkable case. It gives only a glimpse of the plot, but it should serve to give the reader a hint of the methods by which he has been deceived.

In justice to Edward Hines I now offer those portions of the official evidence which bear upon his connection with the election of William Lorimer, and which show that his part in it has been clean and honorable.

FREDERICK UPHAM ADAMS.

Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.

March 20, 1912.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

THE STORY OF EDWARD HINES

One of the delights in reading the newspapers is to create a mental portrait and character study of the person who suddenly attains fame or ill-fame. I conceived that Edward Hines was a cool and calculating "Captain of Industry," born to wealth and fitted to rule, and that our Chicago Lords of Wealth had selected him as their leader in the fight against the rising forces of radicalism.

I was reasonably certain that he was the power behind the Western Money Throne; the forceful commander-in-chief of assault on the cherished rights of the people. He was part god and part knave; high enough to rule and low enough to plot and corrupt. He was the sort of a man who would disinherit his daughter for marrying the young lawyer who had exposed his favorite scheme for stealing a valuable franchise. I longed to put him on the stage or make him the capitalistic villain in a socialist novel.

The real Edward Hines does not fit the above specifications. He is one of the greatest lumbermen in the world, but if I were asked to name his profession from a study of his features and manners I should guess that he was a librarian, or possibly a publisher. Not that he lacks force—he fairly radiates it when he talks or gets into business action, but it is a force emanating from intellect and so blended with sympathy and persuasion that it bears no relation to the brute strength which Money demands when its biddings are to be executed.

Mr. Hines is a man of medium height and build. His speech is rapid but his voice is low and well modulated. His choice of words is excellent, but he should learn how to swear.

In the early stages of the conspiracy against Edward Hines he was pictured in certain newspapers as frequenting saloons and as boasting that he procured the election of Senator Lori-

mer. He was described as a drinker of whiskey and a consumer of expensive cigars, with the inference that his alleged boasting was caused by excessive indulgence in liquor with low companions. These miserable slanders were given wide circulation. Never in his life has he drank whiskey in a saloon or elsewhere. Never in his life has he smoked a cigar expensive or otherwise—not that he has any objection to the habit, but his health forbids. The thousands who know Mr. Hines personally were shocked over the systematic attempt to defame him through such methods, but these vile inventions were nothing compared to the carefully planned assaults on his honor as a citizen.

An astounding accusation was made against him. It is charged that, having subscribed for and collected from the heads of great industrial and financial interests a corruption fund of \$100,000, he was so elated with the success of this infamy that he haunted his clubs, visited saloons, stopped friends and strangers in hotels and on the streets and boasted that he had bribed the Illinois legislature to elect William Lorimer as United States Senator. I don't believe it. You won't believe it when you have read these pages.

His wife is one of the most charming women in the world. He is the proud father of four splendid children. He is a resident of Evanston, Illinois, maintaining a modest establishment in a good old democratic American way. His home life is ideal. Those who have harried him have not dared breathe one word against his character as a husband or his integrity as a business man. The one charge against him is that he boasted of a crime which he did not and could not commit.

EARLY CAREER OF MR. HINES.

Edward Hines was born in Buffalo forty-seven years ago. His parents moved to Chicago and the boy spent a few years in the public schools, but the poverty of his family compelled him to leave school and strike out for himself at the age of fourteen. He started his business career by working in a general store in Chicago for the munificent stipend of \$10 a

month and board. The ten dollars went regularly to his mother. The board—well, the least said about the board the better. Having served a year and a half in that capacity he resigned and entered on a career as a lumberman.

For two months he acted as tally boy with Fish Bros., a lumber firm. It was his duty to keep count of pieces of lumber as they passed from ships to the dock.

His stipend had risen to four dollars a week, but being ambitious he secured a place as office boy for S. K. Martin & Company. Mr. Martin was then the lumber king of Chicago. When he employed little Eddie Hines to head off book agents and insurance solicitors it probably did not occur to Mr. Martin that in a few short years that undersized kid would buy him out, lumber yards, lumber fleet and all.

After a year as office boy he became a clerk, then he invaded the bookkeeping department, rose to be head bookkeeper and then went on the road as salesman. About that time young Hines bought \$20,000 worth of the stock held by his employer and gave him his note at 8 per cent for it. The joke was that he paid for it in six years, and became secretary and treasurer of the company. Then he sold the stock back to Mr. Martin at a generous figure, and thus founded the Edward Hines Lumber Company, with a capital stock of \$200,000.

Among the first stockholders of the Edward Hines Lumber Company was the late Hon. Jesse Spalding, for fifty years a leading and honored figure in the commercial and financial life of Chicago. R. H. McElwee, W. J. Carney and other men of large affairs and high standing were also interested with Mr. Hines in what was destined to be the greatest lumber concern in the world. The original officers were Edward Hines, president; L. L. Barth, vice-president, and C. F. Wiehe, secretary, who hold the same positions to this day.

Mr. Hines then reached out after the lumber trade. He absorbed company after company. Frederick Weyerhaeuser, the great timber land owner, recognized the genius of young Hines and became a stockholder in his enterprises. Fifteen

years after he became office boy for Mr. S. K. Martin he bought out the great lumber concern founded by that gentleman. It was then the largest in Chicago, and probably in the world. Mr. Martin's health had failed and he felt impelled to retire. It was generally known that the great lumber concern was for sale, but Edward Hines alone had the intelligent courage to make a satisfactory bid for Mr. Martin's holdings. The old lumber king accepted the offer, and congratulated the young man who had been his office boy only a few years before.

A few more years passed and the trade realized that Edward Hines handled more lumber than any merchant in the world. The boy who once slept back of the stove in a dingy general store now bought standing timber by hundreds of millions of feet, bought the holdings of great lumbermen who had laughed at his presumption in entering the field against them, became the master of empires of forests along the Canadian border to the north, and of even greater domains along the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. A fleet of twenty ships sail the Great Lakes under his command; he is the owner of twelve great lumber yards, a single one of which in Chicago covers forty-five acres with more than a mile of water frontage; hundreds of superintendents and thousands of men are proud to call him chief; every honor in the gift of the lumber trade has been conferred on him; he is a director in the most powerful bank in Chicago, with the largest deposit in the world; administrative genius and executive ability lifted this penniless and delicate boy to exalted business heights—such has been the business career of Edward Hines.

EDWARD HINES NOT A POLITICIAN.

Nobody ever knew that Mr. Hines was in politics until it was announced by Mr. Funk that Mr. Hines had boasted to him that he (Hines) had elected Lorimer. Veteran politicians smiled or were dazed. Hines? Edward Hines? Who was he? He had never held an office or been a candidate for

office. They could not understand it. They do now. They know that someone lied.

In 1909 Mr. Hines found himself President of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association. The same year witnessed an attempt to put lumber on the free list. As a leading lumberman of the United States and the official head of the great national association of lumber manufacturers it devolved on Mr. Hines to urge on Congress the claims of lumber to tariff protection. He went to Washington for that purpose.

Hines knew nothing of Illinois politics. He knew nothing about Cook County or Chicago politics. It is doubtful if he knew the number of his voting precinct or the boundaries of the congressional district in which he lived. He had never made a political speech, and had no time to listen to those made by others. He was a stranger in Washington. He was a stranger in Springfield.

In the spring of 1909, during the special session of Congress called by President Taft to revise certain tariff schedules, we find Edward Hines in Washington busily engaged in urging the claims of lumber. It was proposed to put lumber and wood pulp on the free list. The newspapers, especially the great newspapers, were in favor of free pulp. That was perfectly logical. They were consumers of paper made from pulp. Free pulp meant money in their pockets. They had a right to ask Congress for it. Mr. Hines manufactured lumber. He did not insist on a high tariff on lumber, and suggested as a reasonable compromise, a reduction of twenty-five per cent, which would retain a rate of about six per cent *ad valorem*, which was agreed upon after full investigation. The newspapers do not use lumber—political planks being made of paper—hence did not care what happened to lumber. Mr. Hines does not use paper—in large quantities—hence was indifferent to the tariff fate of wood pulp.

Therefore we find Mr. Hines in Washington very busy for lumber. His addresses before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and before the Finance

Committee of the United States Senate, brought him into prominence in Washington and elsewhere. His knowledge of every detail of the subject of lumber was exhaustive, and the press bore tribute to his mastery of the subject.

THE ILLINOIS SENATORIAL DEADLOCK.

In the meantime the Legislature of Illinois was deadlocked over a successor to Senator Albert J. Hopkins. Under a new primary law the voters were privileged to express a preference for a party candidate for the senatorship, but this expression was not binding on the members of the state legislature. In the Republican primaries Senator Hopkins led, but Ex-Senator Mason and Congressman Foss received very substantial support. It was evident from the start that Hopkins had no chance before the Illinois Legislature.

The Democrats had voted at the primaries for an excellent gentleman, Lawrence B. Stringer, but he had less chance before the Legislature than Hopkins. The Republicans were split in bitterly warring factions, and the Democrats were in the same fix. Governor Deneen had narrowly escaped defeat on the face of the returns. A combination of Republicans and Democrats had elected Shurtleff as Speaker, and had it in their power to elect an United States Senator.

Governor Deneen, in his sworn testimony in the Lorimer investigation, declares that William Lorimer was in absolute control of the Illinois Legislature from the start, and asserts that Lorimer had it in his power to name the successor to Hopkins. Lorimer offered it to Deneen, who had political reasons for declining, but who knew full well that Lorimer was in earnest and could and would keep his promise.

It would occur to any reasonable mind, that if Mr. Lorimer had the power to force his devoted followers to elect Deneen—his bitter political enemy—or Boutell, McKinley or others mentioned for the place, he surely could induce these same followers to vote for himself.

And yet we are asked to believe that Lorimer dragged the

politically unknown Edward Hines from his lumber mills and planted him in Washington—Washington, mind you—to raise a corruption fund of \$100,000 to bribe members of the Illinois Legislature, many of whom were so insistent on voting for Lorimer from the start that he restrained them with difficulty. Hines was not in Springfield at any time during the legislative deadlock nor for two years thereafter.

The Illinois senatorial deadlock was an established fixture for three or four months before Mr. Hines showed any evidence of being aware of it. He spent practically all of his time in Washington, which had a deadlock of its own in tariff matters. Various delegations of lumbermen came to Washington and consulted with Mr. Hines. Some of them wanted high tariff, some low tariff, some a medium tariff, and a few peculiar lumbermen wanted no tariff. In addition to meeting these delegates, harmonizing their views and bringing them before the committees, Mr. Hines incidentally conducted the affairs of a score of huge lumber companies scattered from Canada to the Gulf.

The Fourth of March passed and Mr. Hopkins' term in the Senate had expired. Illinois was left with only one Senator. If the state legislature adjourned without filling the vacancy the governor could not appoint, and a vacancy would exist until a new legislature should assemble. The Washington administration and Republican senatorial leaders deemed it important that the deadlock should be broken with the election of a Republican senator.

In this situation Senator Penrose asked Mr. Hines if he knew anything about the senatorial situation in Illinois. Mr. Hines said he did not, but would consult with some of the members of the Illinois congressional delegation, including Congressman Lorimer, and later advise Senator Penrose. This was sometime in April. He learned that it was impossible to elect Senator Hopkins, and that the only way to break the deadlock was to bring forward some candidate who could command Democratic votes.

Mr. Hines was a Republican. In his conversations with

the Washington leaders of his party he was assured that it was desirable that the Springfield deadlock should be broken and a successor to Senator Hopkins chosen in time to assist in the passage of those clauses of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill which had the approval of the administration, and they urged Mr. Hines to use his influence to that end. The testimony of Senator Aldrich and of Senator Penrose is conclusive in affirming that such was the motive which they had inspired in Mr. Hines.

SUGGESTED CANDIDATES.

Mr. Hines urged Congressman Lorimer to make an effort to obtain the honor. The latter informed Mr. Hines that he did not desire to be a Senator, explaining that he finally occupied a position in the House of Representatives which enabled him to force to the front certain legislation in favor of deep waterways from Chicago to the Gulf of Mexico—a task to which Lorimer had devoted his energies for sixteen years, and of which he was the recognized champion.

Becoming convinced that Mr. Lorimer was sincere in his refusal to become a candidate before the Illinois Legislature, Mr. Hines suggested the name of Mr. A. C. Bartlett, a well-known Chicago merchant, and wrote to Mr. Lorimer an earnest letter, which was offered in evidence. It was found impossible to unite the warring factions on Mr. Bartlett. Mr. Hines then interested himself in advocating Congressman McKinley and later Congressman Boutell.

Early in May it became apparent that Lorimer was the only man who could unite the warring factions in Springfield, and it was because of this reason that the leaders of the administration in Washington gave his name serious consideration and requested Mr. Hines to urge Mr. Lorimer to become a candidate. This is clearly shown in the testimony of Senators Aldrich and Penrose. About the middle of May, 1909, Mr. Lorimer left Washington for Springfield, and remained there until elected Senator. If he had decided to become a candidate he withheld the information from Mr.

Hines. But the news was in the air, and it was an open secret in Washington as well as in Springfield that Lorimer was considering becoming a candidate.

The story which follows is compiled from the sworn testimony given by Edward Hines on June 29, 1911, before the Senatorial Committee charged with an investigation of the election of William Lorimer. Mr. Hines thus took oath:

"About May 18 or 20 Mr. Aldrich sent for me again and said that the conditions in Illinois indicated that no Senator would be elected, and the Legislature would end in a deadlock; and either from what he had heard from some source, or upon his own idea—I do not know which—he said that it seemed to him that Congressman Lorimer could be elected from that State. He wanted to know if I would see or telephone Congressman Lorimer and urge upon him, if it was a possibility, to become a candidate, or assist in electing some Republican at the earliest date possible. That conversation occurred in his office. The next day or two afterward he telephoned me to meet him at his house in the evening.

"I went there by appointment and he left word that he was called suddenly to a night session of the Senate Finance Committee, down in the rooms of this building, and for me to come there. I went down in the evening a little after 9 o'clock and waited until he got through. I should judge it was somewhere close to 10 o'clock. Then he came out from the Finance Committee room and told me he had sent for me to discuss the Illinois situation. He said: 'I should like to have you go to the White House this evening with me and discuss with the President the Illinois situation.' . . . He finally telephoned the President, in my presence, and asked if he could see him if he went there at that time. This was half-past 10. I remember distinctly his stating: 'It is now half-past 10; if I come up now can I see you for a talk on an important matter?' He did not mention the subject. I do not know what the reply was, but when he got through he said that the President was practically through with his—I think he said his appointments, and that he was free to see him; and he asked me to go to the White House with him. I replied and stated that I felt that it would be better if I did not go to the White House with him. I said: 'Possibly the President might be somewhat embarrassed to talk over the situation with me, and I think it would be better if I do not go to the White House, and you go alone.' He replied urging me to go with him. Finally, upon my stating again my thought that it would be better if I did not go, he said: 'All right, you come to my house and wait until I get back from

the White House.' He and I went up to his house in his car and I waited there until some time about twelve o'clock, when he returned. When he returned he told me he had had a long talk with the President about the situation. . . . He said that the administration was very anxious to have a Senator elected before the Legislature adjourned, and that they felt that Congressman Lorimer might be elected Senator, and they wished to have me emphasize to him the importance—if there was a possibility of it—of his becoming a candidate and doing all he could to be elected at the earliest possible moment.

"I asked Senator Aldrich what I could do in the matter. He said: 'I would like to have you go to a long-distance telephone and call up Congressman Lorimer at Springfield and emphasize that fact.' I said: 'Supposing that the Congressman would like to have that confirmed in a letter or telegram? Am I authorized to do that?' He said: 'You are; and you can state further that if the Governor or any of the leading people at Springfield question this authority they can telegraph me or Senator Penrose, and, if necessary, the President.'

"I went from his house to the Willard Hotel, some time after 12 o'clock at night, and called Congressman Lorimer at Springfield over the long-distance telephone. I said: 'Mr. Lorimer, I have just returned from Senator Aldrich's house. He has just come from the White House. The President and he are very anxious to have you become a candidate, and think you could be elected. They will do all they can to assist. What can they do?' I cannot quote the exact words he replied, but he seemed to be somewhat surprised over the mention of the President's name. I said: 'There is no question about the matter, because I have just come from Senator Aldrich's house, and he has just come from the President.'

"Mr. Lorimer said: 'Mr. Hines, could you have Senator Aldrich send me a telegram confirming this?' He says: 'I might want to show that to the Governor or a few intimate'—I think he said 'friends,' or he might have used some other term; but I understood it as meaning the Governor and two or three other people. I told him that I was authorized to send that telegram. He said: 'Please send it.' I said: 'Will you become a candidate? What are your prospects?' He said: 'At this time I cannot say. After the telegram I will give the matter consideration.' I immediately sent the telegram."

SIGNIFICANT TELEGRAMS.

The telegram then sent by Mr. Hines to Congressman Lorimer read as follows, the original copy being submitted to the Senatorial Committee:

"Washington, D. C., May 25, 1909. William Lorimer, St. Nicholas Hotel, Springfield, Ill. Aldrich authorizes Governor calling him up telephone confirm my message conference last night. Governor requested cooperate bring about result. Can bring message tomorrow. Edward Hines."

On the morning after this conference and the sending of the above message, Mr. Hines sent the following dispatch to Lorimer—the original being offered in evidence:

"Washington, D. C., May 25, 1909. William Lorimer, St. Nicholas Hotel, Springfield, Ill. Leaving for Chicago today. Can go direct to Springfield. Bring message confirming conference held last night, showing highest authorities want you elected before legislature adjourns. Important Republican Party have strong, experienced man friendly to powers that be, elected immediately. Needed here now. Telegraph answer quick, duplicate, care limited train, Harrisburg depot.

"EDWARD HINES."

From the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company was obtained the original ticket covering the long-distance telephone message sent by Mr. Hines to Congressman Lorimer. This was submitted to the investigating committee as the final link to prove the exact movements of Mr. Hines on the night of his conference with Senator Aldrich. This telephone record slip shows that Mr. Hines called from the New Willard Hotel in Washington, D. C., at 12:10 in the early morning of May 25, the day preceding the election of Mr. Lorimer. The slip states that Mr. Hines talked five minutes with William Lorimer at the St. Nicholas Hotel in Springfield, Illinois, and that the cost of this conversation was \$8.75. Mr. Hines left for Chicago before this amount was collected, and later sent his check to the telephone company for payment of this call.

Senator Aldrich confirms the fact that such a conference was held. The Hines-Lorimer telegrams settle that matter and prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the mission of Edward Hines to Chicago was an honorable one, the nature of which was understood by the Senatorial representatives of the Republican administration.

Mr. Hines was the bearer, not of a corruption fund, as the conspirators against him have charged, but of a message concerning a matter which had been discussed between Senator Aldrich and President Taft. He was within his political rights as an American citizen, and he did not take a step for which he can justly be criticised.

MR. HINES ARRIVES IN CHICAGO.

Mr. Hines arrived in Chicago at 8:55 on the morning of May 26, 1909, on his way to Springfield. He was met at the station by Mr. C. F. Wiehe, his brother-in-law and associate in business, who informed him that Mr. Lorimer had called by telephone from Springfield the evening before, stating that it would not be necessary for Mr. Hines to come on to Springfield, and asking Mr. Hines to communicate with him by telephone immediately on his arrival in Chicago.

Mr. Hines then drove in an automobile to the offices of the Continental National Bank, of which he was a director. He immediately put in a long-distance telephone call for Congressman Lorimer. While waiting for it he sent the following telegram from the bank; a carbon copy of which was identified under oath by the bank stenographer to whom it was dictated by Mr. Hines.

"Continental National Bank, Chicago, May 26, 1909. William Lorimer, Esq., Springfield, Ill. Just arrived. Trying to get you telephone. Aldrich, Penrose and higher authority—as telephoned you from Washington—want you elected. Authorized have governor (*and*) others call Washington (*to*) confirm this. (*I*) can be there tonight.

"EDWARD HINES."

The words inserted in italics give the plain purport of this telegram.

Prior to the sending of this telegram Mr. Hines had discussed the senatorial situation with Mr. George M. Reynolds, then President of the Continental National Bank of Chicago, now President of the Continental & Commercial National Bank of Chicago, an institution with the largest deposits of

any bank in the United States. It is conceded in the world of finance that no bank official on earth enjoys a higher reputation than George M. Reynolds.

MR. REYNOLDS TESTIFIES.

The sworn testimony of Mr. Reynolds was such a crushing blow to the anti-Lorimer papers that they ignored most of it. The press at large is still in practical ignorance of its purport. Mr. Reynolds testifies that shortly after nine o'clock on the morning of the day that William Lorimer was elected Senator, Edward Hines came to his office in the bank. I quote an extract from the official record of the testimony:

MR. REYNOLDS. Mr. Hines came to me that morning, as I think, directly from the train, and said he was the bearer of a message which would have an important bearing upon the situation in Illinois politics.

MR. HANEY. Did he say from whom the message was?

MR. REYNOLDS. Yes, he did. The message came directly, as he stated to me, from Senator Aldrich. In the same conversation, however, he explained that the message in reality was coming from the administration, or from President Taft, through Senator Aldrich, and was to be delivered by him to Gov. Deneen.

MR. HANEY. What else did he say to you in that respect?

MR. REYNOLDS. He told me in substance that there had been a conference of some of the leading Senators in Washington upon the question of the election of a Senator in Illinois, there having been one vacancy at that time; and he stated that as a result of that conference he had been commissioned to take this message to Illinois, which, in effect, was that the leaders in the Senate, including the President, had expressed a desire to have a Senator elected before the adjournment of the legislature in Illinois, and that after a consideration of the situation locally they had come to the conclusion that they could probably unite better upon Senator Lorimer (or, rather, upon Congressman Lorimer at that time) than upon anyone else; and he stated to me that he had been commissioned to carry this message to Gov. Deneen, to the effect that they would much prefer to see Senator Lorimer elected than to have the legislature adjourn without an election.

MR. HANEY. Did Mr. Hines say anything to you about how he was to communicate that to Gov. Deneen, or how he wanted to convey that message to Gov. Deneen from the President and the leaders in Washington?

MR. REYNOLDS. I do not think there was any specific discussion about that. He intimated, or rather indicated, that he had expected to go on to Springfield direct, but for some reason or other had been detained in Chicago, and that it would necessitate the message being sent by telephone. He said he did not know quite what was the best way to do it, and asked my advice. I said to him that he being the only party who could know anything about the details of the message itself, I thought he was the only man who could consistently undertake to do the telephoning. Thereupon he asked me if we had a public telephone there, and I told him there was a telephone in the room adjoining mine which he could use. . . . Mr. Hines left my office then and went into the adjoining room and was in the booth for some little time, I do not know how long. In the meantime people had begun to come in to transact their business; and after some time he came back to my office and said that he had talked to Mr. Lorimer and had also talked to Gov. Deneen.

MR. HANEY. Was there anything said by you or Mr. Hines about the possibility of Gov. Deneen not recognizing Mr. Hines' voice, either before Mr. Hines got the Governor or afterwards?

MR. REYNOLDS. I think Mr. Hines intimated before he went into the booth that in his proposed talk with Gov. Deneen he might not recognize his voice, and he said: "I may have to bother you further to step to the phone and identify me."

MR. HANEY. But he did not call on you?

MR. REYNOLDS. He did not; no, sir.

Here is the plain and direct testimony of a man of high character. Not even the most bitter enemies of Edward Hines have dared question the truth of the evidence given by Mr. George M. Reynolds. They have been content with suppressing it.

The testimony above quoted establishes the fact that the mission then being executed by Edward Hines was an honorable one. It proves that he was the bearer of a message from Senator Aldrich. It establishes the character of the message which Mr. Hines later conveyed to Governor Deneen over the telephone. The word of George M. Reynolds needs no support, but it is affirmed by the testimony offered by Senators Aldrich and Penrose.

Against such witnesses we have the unsupported word of Clarence S. Funk, who asks the world to believe that Edward Hines bragged to him—not that he was the bearer of a mes-

sage from Senator Aldrich—but that he was the collector and distributor of a bribery fund of one hundred thousand dollars. Every known fact in this case and the testimony of practically every witness of high standing refutes the statements made by Funk and confirms the truth of the statements made under oath by Edward Hines.

Mr. Hines testifies and proves that he first had a telephone conversation with Congressman Lorimer, Mr. Hines talking from the Continental National Bank in Chicago. Mr. Lorimer urged Mr. Hines to call up Governor Deneen at once and deliver to him the message from Senator Aldrich, and Mr. Hines agreed to do so, and did so.

A MODERN BUSINESS MAN.

To understand just what next happened the reader must grasp one of the details by which Edward Hines has risen to business success. His main offices are on the West Side of Chicago, far from the business center. For several years the great lumberman has annihilated time and space by the use of automobiles and telephones. In the early morning hours he looks over his mail, attends to important correspondence, confers with his executives, then dashes away in a fast car and attends to the innumerable details of matters which call him to scores of offices. But he keeps in constant communication with his home office. There is not a moment in his business day when the chief telephone operator of that office cannot locate Mr. Hines. He is therefore in constant touch with any person having demands on his time and attention.

Years ago Mr. Hines invented a system which others might profitably copy. In making out-of-town calls he first connects with his home office, and it is the business of the operator in charge to keep a record of the call and the exact time consumed in the conversation. This serves a double purpose; first, it creates a valuable office record which takes

the place of a correspondence file; second, it enables the office to check up the accounts rendered by the telephone company each month.

Most of the evidence in the Lorimer case, intended to reflect on Edward Hines, is effectively riddled and proved absolutely false by reference to the records which have been preserved by Miss Frances Carroll, the skilled operator in charge of the private telephone exchange of the Edward Hines Lumber Company. These show the exact time and place of out-of-town calls, and unanswerably disprove many of the clumsy falsehoods invented and sworn to by conspirators.

MR. HINES DELIVERS HIS MESSAGE.

In talking with Congressman Lorimer from the offices of the Continental National Bank of Chicago, Mr. Hines used a wire which ran through the private exchange of his main office at 2431 South Lincoln Street, and Miss Carroll "stayed in on the call," that is, she listened so as to be able to note and record its duration. A few minutes later she notified Mr. Hines that two lumbermen, Mr. William O'Brien and Mr. Wirt H. Cook, desired to see him at the Grand Pacific Hotel on very important business. They were stockholders in one of Mr. Hines' large lumber companies. We will now let Mr. Hines tell his version of what followed, as related by him under oath:

I told the operator I could not go over immediately and to put in a call through our office for Governor Deneen, Springfield, Ill., and emphasized to our operator, Miss Carroll, the importance of giving it personal attention and getting Gov. Deneen at the earliest possible moment. I told her I would remain at the Continental National Bank until she had located Gov. Deneen on the wire. I should judge it was about half-past 10 when the telephone rang again, and the boy told me that our office wanted to speak to me. I went to the telephone and Miss Carroll's voice—I recognized the voice—said: "Mr. Hines, here is Gov. Deneen, at Springfield." I said: "Hello! is this Gov. Deneen?" and the voice said, "Yes, this is Gov. Deneen, at Springfield." I said, "This is Mr. Edward Hines, at Chicago. I have just come in this morning on the limited train from Washington, and was on

my way to Springfield to bring the message to you from Senator Aldrich and the President, urging you to do all you possibly can to assist in the election of a Senator at the earliest moment possible. They understand that Congressman Lorimer can be elected if you will assist." He replied, "How do I know who I am talking to?" I said, "Governor, Mr. George Reynolds, with whom you are acquainted, is in the next room. I can call him to the telephone and confirm who I am, and the honesty of my purpose." He then appeared to recognize my voice and said, "Not necessary, Mr. Hines, I now recognize your voice." I said, "How soon can you see Mr. Lorimer?" He said, "I will see him within ten minutes." I said, "Can we rely on your assistance?" He said, "Yes," as I understood him. I said, "Will you see him immediately?" and he said, "I will see him within fifteen minutes." I think that was all the conversation at that time.

Miss Frances Carroll, the young woman in charge of the private telephone exchange of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, testifies that her records show that Edward Hines talked with Governor Deneen on May 26, 1909, and that the conversation lasted from 10:25 a. m. to 10:29 a. m. This was officially confirmed by the records of the Chicago Telephone Company.

DENEEN CONFIRMS EDWARD HINES.

In his official testimony, Governor Deneen is not exactly clear concerning what was said over the telephone. It was the morning of the day on which Lorimer was elected. Governor Deneen testifies that he was aware that Lorimer's election was practically a certainty. Springfield was in a state of political excitement, and it is natural that Gov. Deneen should not preserve a very clear recollection of exactly what was said. In his direct examination Gov. Deneen testified as follows:

Mr. Hines called me up and asked me whether I had received a message from the President—President Taft—in reference to Senator Lorimer. He stated that President Taft had sent a message to me to support Senator Lorimer, and asked me if I had received the message. I told him no. He said, "Well, President Taft has sent the message, and I intended to come down myself. I have just arrived this morning in Chicago," and my best recollection is that he stated that his train was late, had

a five minutes' connection, and the Pennsylvania train had missed connections. But in any event he said President Taft had sent that message to me and I would get it. I said: "Did President Taft send that message to me? Did he tell you?" He said, "No." I said, "That is a remarkable message to send." He said, "Of course the President would not send a message to you on such a matter where it would become a public matter; but Senator Aldrich is to convey the message to you." I said, "Through whom?" He said, "Mr. George Reynolds, of the Continental Commercial Bank, will call up and deliver the message." I said, "Very well." The telephone was hung up and that ended it.

Governor Deneen gave this testimony on July 13, 1911, more than two years after the event. This telephone conversation was not a highly important happening in the life of Gov. Deneen; a hundred things occurred of almost equal importance that day. It was different with Edward Hines. He was playing his first big role in politics—delivering a message which he believed to come from the President. The Hines statement fits with the facts as given by Senators Penrose and Aldrich, and by George M. Reynolds and the telegraphic correspondence submitted to the Senatorial Committee. The proof that Edward Hines told the plain truth is overwhelming, and crumbles the foundation of falsehood laid by the conspirators.

Governor Deneen's testimony clearly indicates a desire on his part to obscure the fact that Mr. Hines informed him over the telephone wire that the Republican leaders at Washington were favorable to the candidacy of Mr. Lorimer. Deneen even went so far as to state that he was not sure that Mr. Hines was the gentleman at the other end of the wire. In another place we find him admitting that he did know that it was Hines. Deneen cannot remember that he pledged himself to assist in the selection of Lorimer. There is ample proof that he did, and there is most convincing proof that Deneen gave to Edward Hines such an impression. Immediately after his telephone conversation with Governor Deneen, Mr. Hines sent from the Continental Bank of Chicago the following telegram to Congressmen Lorimer at Springfield;

CHICAGO, MAY 26, 1909.

William Lorimer, Esq.,
Springfield, Ill.

Talked with Deneen over telephone; says not necessary my coming down; understands subject fully; glad I called him telephone; consider confidential.

CHICAGO PARTY.

(Charge Edward Hines.)

A CONVINCING TELEGRAM.

This telegram clearly indicates that Mr. Hines was fully satisfied with the results of his interview with Governor Deneen over the telephone. It proves that Mr. Hines considered that he had delivered the message which had been intrusted to him by Senator Aldrich. It proves that he had no other motive in taking a part in breaking the Illinois Senatorial deadlock. In the mind of any honest man it removes the last shade of suspicion that Edward Hines was corruptly concerned in the election of William Lorimer. The telegram just quoted, the plain testimony of Senator Aldrich, the pointed truth sworn to by George M. Reynolds, the grudging admissions of Governor Deneen, all confirm the fact that Edward Hines was taking an honorable part in the selection of an United States Senator whose candidacy was endorsed by the national leaders of the Republican Party.

Mr. Hines assumed that Congressman Lorimer had already informed Deneen of the purport of the telegram sent by Hines to Lorimer. Aldrich would confirm it, and Hines was justified in assuming that Deneen already had an inkling of its purport. Deneen confused the purport of the mention of Mr. Reynolds' name.

It is unimportant whether or not Gov. Deneen had an accurate memory of just what was said. The important thing is that he confirms the claim made by Edward Hines to the effect that the latter was the bearer of, or had knowledge of, a message from Senator Aldrich in favor of the candidacy of Lorimer for the Illinois senatorship.

The sworn testimony of Governor Charles S. Deneen forges the last link to prove that the activities of Edward Hines in behalf of William Lorimer were legitimate and honorable. His testimony proves that the sole motive of Mr. Hines in journeying from Washington to Chicago and intending to go to Springfield was to convey a message authorized by Senator Aldrich. Mr. Hines delivered that message to Governor Deneen, Lorimer was elected senator a few hours later, and Mr. Hines was justified in assuming that he had taken an important part in the selection of a man whom he admired and respected.

Immediately after the talk with Governor Deneen, Mr. Hines called up his office and asked Miss Carroll to connect him with Congressman Lorimer as soon as possible. Miss Carroll informed Mr. Hines that Mr. Wirt H. Cook and Mr. William O'Brien were waiting for him at the Grand Pacific Hotel, that they had to catch a train, and were very anxious to see him on a matter of great importance. She was instructed by Mr. Hines to make a connection with Mr. Cook's room as soon as she heard from Congressman Lorimer.

Mr. Hines then informed Mr. Reynolds that he had delivered the message to Governor Deneen, gave the banker the purport of the conversation, and then hastened to the Grand Pacific Hotel to keep the engagement made with Wirt H. Cook and William O'Brien. Over the telephone in Mr. Cook's room in this hotel Mr. Hines had a brief telephone interview with Congressman Lorimer and related his long-distance conversation with Governor Deneen.

On the following afternoon Mr. Hines was again at the Union League Club, and it was then and there that he had an interview with Clarence S. Funk, whose account of said interview constitutes the strange foundation on which has been reared the structure of falsehood and abuse of which Edward Hines has been the victim, and on which has been based the present investigation of the election of William Lorimer to the Senate of the United States.

It is now in order to take up the strange testimony of Mr. Funk. Let us first get our bearings.

Senator Lorimer was elected on May 26, 1909, and took his seat shortly afterwards. On April 30, 1910, the Chicago Tribune purchased and printed the viciously false story of Charles A. White, which resulted in a demand by Senator Lorimer that the United States Senate investigate the charges made against him. The hearings were started on September 22, 1910. The senatorial committee, headed by Senator Burrows, finally reported in favor of Senator Lorimer by a vote of eleven to two, and the Senate decided for Lorimer on March 1, 1911, by a vote of 46 to 40.

MR. KOHLSAAT TAKES HIS PEN IN HAND.

On February 15, 1911, there appeared in the Chicago Record-Herald an editorial which Mr. H. H. Kohlsaatt—then editor and publisher—admits that he wrote or inspired. It read as follows:

Bailey's Fallacy—With Applications.

Senator Bailey has almost convinced himself that there was no corruption at all in the Illinois Legislature which sent Lorimer to the Senate. His grand "forgery" climax was cruelly spoiled, but undaunted he asserted that there was little except suspicion and talk in the Lorimer and "jack-pot" scandals. Generalizing, he contends that there is much less corruption and graft in the country than many people, misled by muckrakers, have been led to believe.

Now, this general statement may be true without lending any force whatever to Bailey's view of concrete cases. Do we know all that we might about the Illinois jackpot? Do we know all there is to know concerning the \$100,000 fund which was raised to pay for Lorimer votes? Do we know the true inwardness of the Browne, Erbstein, Kelley trials?

In some instances there is undoubtedly more cry than there is wool in muckraking affairs. In others, like the Albany Allds-Conger scandal, the Illinois Lorimer affair and jackpot, the facts are much graver than the average voter in certain districts realizes, or men like Browne, Broderick, and Wilson would never have been re-elected. If all the facts were known about Springfield and Albany graft a good many men would be moving penitentiary-ward. In cases of bribery, perjury, looting of public treasuries, it is not easy to get the "parties" to talk, for obvious reasons. What loose writers here and there say about unspeci-

fied graft has no bearing on concrete cases. In such cases the question is one of evidence—its quantity and quality—and of inference, probability or reasonable interpretation.

The "Helm Committee," representing the Illinois Senate, hired alleged "investigators" to search for any clue which would involve Senator Lorimer. Mr. Kohlsaas was called before that committee and asked to tell how he knew that \$100,000 had been expended for Lorimer votes. Mr. Kohlsaas replied that a man in whom he had confidence had told him. Who was the man? Mr. Kohlsaas declared that he could not reveal the name of the gentleman who had told him the story about the \$100,000 in sacred confidence.

Mr. Kohlsaas did not tell the committee that he had told the story to scores of persons in Chicago, had written about it to ex-President Roosevelt, to several U. S. Senators, and had revealed most of the facts to rival newspaper editors. He had given it a circulation almost equal to that of his paper, but he would not let the Helm Committee into his confidence without the consent of the man who had reposed in him the thrilling story.

THE SECRETIVE MR. KOHLSAAS.

The Helm Committee "investigation" was a personally conducted affair under the management of the Chicago Tribune. Kohlsaas had revealed his remarkable discoveries to Mr. Healy—a fact reluctantly admitted in the later hearing before the Senatorial investigating committee. I call the attention of the reader to the records of the Helm Committee, and particularly to the stern attempt of Attorney Healy to force Mr. Kohlsaas to let the "investigators" into his confidence.

MR. KOHLSAAS. I am sorry I cannot do it, that I cannot give you the information, but it is really impossible for me to violate that confidence.

MR. HEALY. Did this informant tell you that he was approached with the request that he should contribute \$10,000 to this \$100,000 fund?

MR. KOHLSAAS. I decline to answer, Mr. Healy.

MR. HEALY. And which contribution on his part was to be

used in conjunction with the Senatorial election in Illinois in 1909?

MR. KOHLSAAT. I must decline to answer that.

MR. HEALY. Did he tell you that he was one of ten men who were asked to contribute to such a fund?

MR. KOHLSAAT. I decline to answer.

The play was staged nicely. The beautiful loyalty of Mr. Kohlsaatz to his unknown friend despite the stern questioning of a committee, some of whose members knew the fabrication almost as well as Mr. Kohlsaatz; the awful threat to incarcerate Mr. Kohlsaatz in Springfield unless he changed his mind in a few days; the return of the editor to Chicago; the breathless hours of suspense, every passing one of which brought Mr. Kohlsaatz nearer his doom—and then an act of devotion on the part of Funk—Mr. Clarence S. Funk, general manager of the International Harvester Company—a feat of loyalty and superb unselfishness worthy of the immortal Pecksniff.

“You shall not go to jail,” declared Clarence, as he wept into the mouthpiece of his telephone. “Tell the cruel committee that I am the author of the story which you have guarded so sacredly.”

Armed with a dispensation from Clarence S. Funk the enterprising editor returned to Springfield and dazzled the committee with his recollections of what had been told him. It was nearly a year since Funk had revealed the story in strict confidence, and the theory is that in the editor’s discussion of it with his many intimate friends—to all of whom Mr. Kohlsaatz revealed it in strict confidence—he unconsciously assimilated their suggestions and conjectures and amalgamated them with the original version given by Clarence and was therefore unable to separate the tale told by the Harvester manager from the valuable additions volunteered by others.

A FEW OBSERVATIONS ABOUT MR. FUNK.

Before introducing Mr. Funk on the stand let me set the stage scenery and adjust the lights.

Mr. Clarence S. Funk is the general manager of the International Harvester Company. That company is controlled by

the McCormicks. The vast McCormick manufacturing plant is on both sides of a fork of the Chicago river. The McCormicks wished to fill in the river and thus join the two split parts of their plant. This meant millions to them, but it also meant enormous losses to the property owners who would thus partially be cut off from the main branch of the Chicago River. On this West Fork of the South Branch of the river, west of Western Avenue are such large manufacturing concerns as the W. W. Kimball Piano Company, the Peoples' Gas Light & Coke Company, the Barrett Manufacturing Company, the Liquid Carbonate Company and other large plants, to say nothing of the huge City Bridewell. It was to their interest to have this fork of the river deepened and widened.

For twenty years William Lorimer has been an advocate of deep water from Chicago to the Gulf. Even his enemies admit that he is the father of legislation on this subject. The McCormicks wished to close an integral part of that system. Lorimer naturally opposed it. A branch of the McCormick family is heavily interested in the Chicago Tribune. That powerful paper is the head and front of the fight to depose Lorimer. It is an open secret that the Chicago Tribune has spent a quarter of a million of dollars to "drive Lorimer out of Illinois politics." The plight of the Harvester Company may not be the sole motive, but any student of this wonderful case should be aware of the causes which have brought about the present alliance.

Clarence S. Funk as general manager was in charge of the pressing of bills in the Legislatures of various States and at Washington which would favor the company, and the defeat of measures on which his superiors looked askance. When a man engaged in such work drinks, smokes and occasionally swears he is called a lobbyist. When he teaches a Bible class and acts for a great moral trust he is sometimes called a "legislative agent" and sometimes a "general manager."

Edward Hines knew that Funk was a bitter political enemy of Senator Lorimer. Hines and Funk had little in common.

They had no political, social or business alliances, and only a speaking acquaintance. Funk was about the last man on earth in whom Hines would repose a confidence or from whom he would ask a favor for Senator Lorimer. Financially they moved in different spheres. Hines was the master mind of vast enterprises, the employer of thousands of men and one of the most conspicuous figures in one of the great industries of the United States; Funk is a paid official in a corporation.

Do you catch the perspective? Are the lights properly adjusted? If so we will let Mr. Clarence S. Funk take the center of the stage.

THE STRANGE STORY OF MR. FUNK.

After Mr. H. H. Kohlsaatt had revealed that Funk was the author of the \$100,000 bribery story, the latter was subpoenaed to appear before the Helm Committee in Springfield, Illinois, which he did on April 5, 1911. This was nearly two years after the election of Senator Lorimer and of the alleged happening to which Funk now testified. Mr. Funk was sworn and then examined by Mr. Healy, the attorney of the committee. I quote the essential parts of his testimony on that occasion:

MR. HEALY. I direct your attention to a conversation that you had with Edward Hines, of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, in the latter part of the month of May, 1909, or the early part of the month of June, 1909. Did such a conversation take place?

MR. FUNK. Well, I cannot identify the month. I had a conversation with Edward Hines shortly after Lorimer was elected United States Senator by the legislature.

MR. HEALY. Well, it is the record here that the election of Senator Lorimer was on the 26th of May, 1909. Directing your mind to that time, or about that time, when was it that this conversation occurred?

MR. FUNK. It was shortly after that. I could not say whether it was five days or ten, but it was a short time afterwards.

MR. HEALY. Where did that conversation take place?

MR. FUNK. Union League Club, Chicago.

MR. HEALY. Was the conference arranged in any way or was it more or less accidental?

MR. FUNK. I met Mr. Hines accidentally, and he said he had been trying to get a chance to see me, or get time to see me.

MR. HEALY. In what part of the Union League Club did that conversation take place?

MR. FUNK. In the large lounging room right off the entrance.

MR. HEALY. And about what time of day, Mr. Funk?

MR. FUNK. It was after lunch, in the afternoon.

MR. HEALY. Now, will you tell the committee, Mr. Funk, what occurred and what was said at that conversation by Mr. Hines and by yourself?

MR. FUNK. Do you want me to undertake to repeat it verbatim?

SENATOR HELM. Where you can remember the exact language you will give it, and where you can not, then give the substance.

MR. FUNK. Well, he said I was just the fellow he had been looking for, or trying to see, and said he wanted to talk to me a minute. So we went and sat down on one of the leather couches there on the side of the room, and without any preliminaries, and quite as a matter of course, he said, "Well, we put Lorimer over down at Springfield, but it cost us about one hundred thousand dollars to do it." Then he went on to say that they had to act quickly when the time came; that they had no chance to consult anyone beforehand. I think his words were these: "We had to act quickly when the time came, so we put up the money." Then he said, "We—now we are seeing some of our friends so as to get it fixed up." He said they had advanced the money; that they were now seeing several people whom they thought would be interested to get them to reimburse them. I asked him why he came to us. I said, "Why do you come to us?"—meaning the harvester company. He said, "Well, you people are just as much interested as any of us in having the right sort of a man at Washington." Well, I said—I think I replied, and said, "We won't have anything to do with the matter at all." He said, "Why not?" I said, "Simply because we are not in that sort of business." And we had some aimless discussion back and forth, and I remember I asked him how much he was getting from his different friends. He said, "Well, of course we can only go to a few big people; but if about ten of us will put up \$10,000 apiece that will clean it up." That is the substance of the conversation. I am repeating it verbatim just as far as I can, Mr. Chairman. I do not undertake to say that it is absolutely exact. I left him then in just a moment. As I left he asked me to think it over. I made no reply to that. I just walked away.

I will submit the proof later—let us briefly analyze the testimony given by Funk and see if it conforms to the rules of probability or even possibility. What are we asked to believe?

WHAT WE ARE ASKED TO BELIEVE.

FIRST: That Edward Hines, “quite as a matter of course,” admitted to a comparative stranger that he was a criminal, and that he had been the active agent in procuring by bribery the election of William Lorimer to the Senate of the United States.

SECOND: That he made that astounding admission to an official of the International Harvester Company, a corporation known by Hines to be bitterly hostile to Senator Lorimer.

THIRD: That Edward Hines made a criminal confession to a direct representative of the McCormicks, knowing that the Harvester McCormicks were related to the Tribune McCormicks—Hines being personally aware that the Chicago Tribune was rabid in its warfare on Senator Lorimer.

FOURTH: That Edward Hines asked of Funk that the McCormicks become participants in a crime which had been perpetrated against the political and financial interests of said McCormicks.

FIFTH: We are asked to believe that Edward Hines made this grotesque request to a man whom he must have known had no power to grant it.

SIXTH: Hines is alleged to have said: “We had to act quickly when the time came, so we put up the money.” What utter drivel! Millions of words of testimony have been produced to attempt to prove that Lorimer had conspired for months to bring about his own election. Now we are told that it happened so quickly that Hines had to put up the money.

I could give a score more of palpable inconsistencies in the Funk statement. I call on the reader to note the thinly veiled venom which crops out in it. Please note that the virtuous Funk indignantly spurned the proposition made by Mr. Hines, and then “we had some aimless discussion back and forth.” In the language of a famous character in

Dickens, "Here is richness!" I ask the reader what he would do if a criminal asked him to participate in a despicable villainy? A man of spirit, he would kick such a cur from his presence. Not so with Funk. His virtue did not shrink back abashed when Hines tried to violate it. Not at all. "We had some aimless discussion back and forth."

So much for the face value of the Funk story. Even if no positive evidence could be produced against it I contend that it stamps itself as a tissue of falsehoods or the product of a diseased imagination. This is a bald statement, but I am on safe ground.

Let me call the attention of the reader to a remarkable fact. The Funk testimony against Edward Hines is not supported by a living human witness, an authenticated record, a scrap of paper or one fragment of corroborative evidence which can be adduced in proof of a statement which possesses not a feature of verisimilitude. It came from Funk. It is supported solely by Funk. It must stand or fall with Funk—and it has fallen.

Every essential statement made by Edward Hines is corroborated by witnesses of high character, by letters, telegrams and official records, the validity of which cannot be called into question, and by every concrete fact which enters into this case. The impartial student need not accept the unsupported word of Edward Hines for anything. The unimpeached testimony of honest witnesses and the mute evidence of official business records as well as every canon of probability proclaim his innocence and convict those responsible for the conspiracy against an honorable man and an upright citizen.

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED.

In his examination before the Dillingham Senatorial Committee—the one conducting the present Lorimer investigation—Funk did not have so enjoyable a time as in his original appearance in Springfield.

He swore positively that he was standing in the west end of the Union League Club lounging room on the day in

question, and that Hines approached him and exclaimed: "Hello! You are just the fellow I have been looking for! I want to talk to you a minute," whereupon they moved over to a couch, sat down, and Funk listened to the criminal proposition made by the wealthy lumberman.

This is disproved by four witnesses who were seated on that very couch and who flatly contradict Clarence S. Funk.

On May 27, 1909, the day following the election of Senator Lorimer, Edward Hines went to the Union League Club, of which he is a member, and there met by appointment Mr. Fred Carney, a lumberman from Marinette, Wisconsin. Mr. Hines was negotiating with Carney for a large quantity of lumber. Assisting him in these negotiations were Mr. Charles Hall, the Canadian buyer for Mr. Hines, also Mr. Isaac Baker, chief lumber buyer of the Edward Hines Lumber Company. They met by appointment at about one o'clock at the Union League, and were seated on the aforesaid long leather couch located in the northwest corner of the lobby discussing the business which called them together, when Funk approached. Mr. Hines thus testified:

I noticed Mr. Funk approaching me. When we first noticed him he was probably within—oh, I should say six or eight feet. He came to me, and when I saw he was approaching me I got up and shook hands with him. He said to me, "I am very glad to hear that Mr. Lorimer has been elected Senator," or words to that effect.

I said, "I am pleased that you are glad that he is, and he ought to make a good representative of the State." He then said to me, "I would like very much indeed, at your earliest convenience, if you would arrange to introduce me to Senator Lorimer. I have never met him, and I would like to have you introduce me to him."

This portion of the conversation occurred within a few feet of Messrs. Carney, Hall and Baker—gentlemen of standing and high repute—all of them heard it, and all of them testified under oath to the substantial accuracy of the above statement made by Mr. Hines when on the stand. These three gentlemen also testified that Funk took Hines by the arm and led him

toward the main entrance, where they stood and conversed a few minutes. They were in the sight but not in the hearing of these three witnesses.

THE EAGER FUNK.

The evidence shows, beyond any chance of contradiction, that Mr. Hines was sitting on the long sofa in the northwest corner of the large room, and that he was engaged in an important business conference with these three gentlemen. It proves that Funk then *came across the room, going by the entrance and out of his way, with the obvious purpose of seeking Mr. Hines.* The testimony shows in detail that Mr. Hines did not notice Mr. Funk until the latter was directly in front of him. Anyone familiar with the lounging room of the Union League Club is aware that one may pass through the entrance and down the stairs without meeting or noticing the occupant of the couch, unless he be deliberately searching for some member or guest of the club.

This pointedly contradicts the testimony of the former to the effect that Mr. Hines was lounging about the room and rushed up to him to make a most astounding proposition.

What was said in that brief interview is a matter of the relative veracity of Edward Hines and Clarence S. Funk. The former testifies as follows:

As we got to the entrance of the club, going out, there is a large pillar as you turn to go down Jackson boulevard, and he said to me: "The Senator must have been put to more or less expense in this contest for the Senatorship, and he ought not to stand that. The business interests ought to take it off his hands. We would like to contribute to that expense." I said to him that I did not know anything about the matter, but I said, "I will see and let you know." We parted there. I went back to the gentleman with whom I was engaged in business, and I presume he went down the stairs. . . . Knowing the intense feeling that had existed between the McCormick people and Congressman Lorimer, and Mr. Funk having recently taken charge as general manager of the company, I thought he was trying to curry favor with Mr. Lorimer now that he had been elected Senator.

Mr. Hines saw Senator Lorimer on the following Sunday

evening, told about meeting Funk and said that Funk was anxious to be introduced.

"Mr. Funk is one of my active enemies, Mr. Hines," said Mr. Lorimer, "and I do not care to meet him."

Mr. Hines explained that he had practically promised an introduction, and Mr. Lorimer said: "As long as you have promised, I will meet him."

Mr. Hines then said: "Congressman, were you put to any great expense in the contest down in Springfield?"

"Well, you know I don't drink or smoke," laughed Lorimer, "and I was not put to any extra expense down at Springfield."

On the following day, Monday, May 31, 1909, Mr. Hines left for Washington. Before leaving he instructed Mr. Wiehe to go and see Mr. Funk and tell him "there was nothing in the matter he talked to me about at the Union League Club."

FUNK SEEKS EDWARD HINES.

What followed is clearly brought out in the testimony. It absolutely proves that Mr. Hines was only vaguely interested in the palpable attempt of Clarence S. Funk to obtain a seat on "The Lorimer band wagon," as a popular political phrase would express it. I ask a careful reading of the following testimony:

MR. HINES. On Monday morning, and before taking the train for Washington, I told our secretary, Mr. Wiehe, to see Mr. Funk and tell him there was nothing in the matter he had talked to me about.

QUESTION. Did Mr. Wiehe report to you the delivery of the message?

MR. HINES. He did. He called me up on the telephone in connection with some other matters, I think, on the Wednesday following.

QUESTION. Where?

MR. HINES. From Chicago to Washington.

QUESTION. You were in Washington and he in Chicago?

MR. HINES. Yes.

QUESTION. What report did he make?

MR. HINES. He said the reply did not seem to suit Mr. Funk. Mr. Funk was anxious to meet me in Washington the following Saturday. I told Mr. Wiehe I could not tell whether I

would meet Mr. Funk in Washington or could meet him on the following Saturday. I sent Mr. Wiehe this telegram:

The original of the following telegram was submitted in evidence:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 4, 1909.

Edward Hines Lumber Company, Chicago.

Will try have Funk meet me Chicago Saturday or Sunday. Could meet him any time late. Leave here today. Answer quick.

EDWARD HINES.

In answer to this telegram the following was received by Mr. Hines from his Chicago office:

CHICAGO, ILL., June 4, 1909.

Edward Hines, New Willard Hotel, Washington D. C.

Funk New York today. Leaves this afternoon, Washington. There tomorrow. You can reach him today, George Perkins' office or Judge Gary, 51 Broadway.

EDWARD HINES LUMBER COMPANY.

Mr. Hines testifies that he did not wait in Washington for Mr. Funk, that he did not communicate with him in New York, and that he assumed that Mr. Funk would later confer with him in Chicago. No business matter was pending between them. He did not see Funk or hear from him again that year, and the latter never again referred in any way to his desire to make a contribution to the alleged Lorimer campaign fund. The Wiehe telegrams indicate clearly that Funk was anxious to see Mr. Hines on the subject discussed between them at the Union League Club, and the indifference displayed by Mr. Hines is convincing proof that he regarded the incident as closed. It is impossible to reconcile the inference conveyed by these telegrams with the Funk charge that the lumberman solicited him for \$10,000 or any other sum for corrupt purposes.

In Funk's account of his meeting with Hines at the Union League Club he quotes Hines as saying that he had been looking for Funk some time. Where? Hines had returned from Washington only the day before. He had been busy every moment of his time either in communicating with Governor Deneen and Congressman Lorimer in Springfield, or in important business engagements in Chicago, the minute details

of which were brought out in an exhaustive cross-examination. Mr. Hines introduced certified records which account for every moment of his time from his arrival in Chicago until his accidental meeting with Funk. On the day of that meeting Mr. Hines took his luncheon at his office, and went to the Union League Club for the sole purpose of keeping a business engagement with well known lumbermen.

The inference given by Funk that Mr. Hines was looking for him is absurd on its face. If Mr. Hines had desired to see Funk he would have telephoned and asked for an appointment. Has Funk any record or any evidence to that effect? Does he wish the public to believe that a man as busy as Edward Hines was so slack in his business methods and so anxious to kill time that he lounged about the Union League Club for hours doing nothing but waiting for a chance to see Funk?

Funk has Hines "approaching" him that day in the Union League Club. The constant trend of Funk's testimony is to the effect that Hines was chasing after him on all occasions. The proof is to the contrary. Four reputable witnesses swear that Funk approached Hines. Funk is unable to identify the date of this happening. He has not been able to fix in any positive way the date of any alleged happening, or to fortify anything he says with the slightest bit of corroborative evidence.

It was not until December, 1910, that the two men met again. This was in Washington, during the Deep Waterways convention. They met in the lobby of the New Willard Hotel. We will let Mr. Funk tell the story. Read it carefully. It throws strong light on his character:

MR. FUNK. I was standing in the lobby of the New Willard Hotel with Harold McCormick, who, as I recall, was a delegate to the deep waterways convention. We were standing talking with some gentlemen when Mr. Hines came up and shook hands with both of us and said, "Oh, by the way, Senator Lorimer is upstairs, and I want both of you men to meet him."

MR. MARBLE (Attorney for Senatorial Committee). What did you say then?

MR. FUNK. Well, I looked at Mr. McCormick and he looked at me, and we both looked out of the window, and I waited for him to say something and he waited for me.

MR. MARBLE. Finally what was decided on?

MR. FUNK. It resulted in Mr. Hines taking us to the elevator and our going up and being introduced to Senator Lorimer.

MR. MARBLE. Had you ever requested Mr. Hines to secure you this introduction?

MR. FUNK. Never.

MR. MARBLE. You are sure of that?

MR. FUNK. That is the best of my recollection.

The cross-examination brought out many details of Mr. Funk's distressing plight during those painful moments. We find this on Page 576 of the record:

MR. HYNES. What significance did you intend to give that statement—when you told it to the committee here—that you looked at him (Harold McCormick) and he looked through the window?

MR. FUNK. If I had been alone, I should have found some reason for not meeting the Senator; but I rather put it up to Mr. McCormick, who happened to be with me.

MR. HYNES. And after that exchange of looks, did you then assent, or were you taken bodily by Mr. Hines up to Senator Lorimer's room?

MR. FUNK. I was not taken bodily, and I do not remember whether I assented or Mr. McCormick did. We went up.

I submit that there are few incidents in history more pathetic than this. Clarence and his friend alone in Washington. Along comes the wicked Hines and asks them to meet the even more wicked Senator Lorimer. Under the spell of the wicked Hines, the innocent little general manager of the Harvester Trust and his helpless companion gaze out of the window to escape the hypnotic glare in the eyes of the wizard lumberman. They are speechless. Then they go upstairs and meet the most awful man in all the world. In his cross-examination Clarence admitted that the conversation between himself, his friend and the terrible Senator "was very pleasant and general in its terms and lasted about two minutes." The two then escaped from the contaminating presence, ran down stairs and had a dish of ice-cream.

This was about a year and a half after Hines is alleged to have informed Funk that Lorimer was elected by bribery. Yet

the record reveals the peculiar fact that Funk did not hesitate to ask favors of Lorimer and Hines. I presume that Funk's training as a lobbyist stood him in good stead at this time. Ordinary citizens, knowing what Funk claimed to know, would not have spoken to Lorimer or Hines, much less pleaded with them for petty favors.

For some reason, utterly bewildering to me, the press for some time accepted the word of Funk and declined to give to the public the facts presented under oath by Hines and other witnesses. There were no witnesses to the alleged conversations reflecting on the Chicago lumberman. It is therefore the unsupported word of Funk against the indignant denial of Hines, the latter being supported by the corroborative testimony of many witnesses and the mute but positive evidence of hundreds of verified records. I take it that if the veracity of either be impeached the word of the other will be accepted by just and impartial readers of the evidence. Clarence S. Funk is the star accuser of Edward Hines. The testimony of most of his supporting witnesses is puerile and absolutely incompetent in any court known to our law.

THE IMPEACHMENT OF FUNK.

I will first introduce a bit of Funk's testimony to show his general recklessness and unreliability as a witness, and to indicate his standing as the accuser of Edward Hines. I select it from a portion of his cross-examination by W. J. Hynes, attorney for Edward Hines before the Dillingham Committee. It is found on Page 595 of the printed government record of the hearing.

MR. HYNES. You spoke, Mr. Funk, of Mr. Hines' activities at Springfield. What did you have reference to there?

MR. FUNK. Why, it was a matter of common talk that he was very active down there.

MR. HYNES. What did you understand he was doing down there?

MR. FUNK. Pulling wires for the election of Senator Lorimer.

MR. HYNES. What do you mean by that? What was he

doing? How long was he down in Springfield before the election?

MR. FUNK. I do not know.

MR. HYNES. Have you any recollection as to anybody saying that he was in Springfield active about the election of Lorimer?

MR. FUNK. I have a very distinct recollection that he was down there, and he was very busy there, and also in Washington. That was a matter of common talk.

Did Clarence S. Funk dig this up out of his own memory or did he glean it from the lying columns of certain newspapers? These papers had pictured Edward Hines hastening from Washington or Chicago to Springfield. They had described him with a grip or a bag stuffed with bills of large denomination. The bribery fund thus carried by Edward Hines varied in amounts according to the imagination or the malignity of the writers of such accusations. The readers of these papers had been drilled to believe that Hines had been in Springfield personally distributing this corruption fund to the men who later voted for William Lorimer.

It was therefore no surprise to the public when Funk testified that "I have a very distinct recollection that he (Hines) was down there, and that he was very busy there."

THE "RECOLLECTIONS" OF FUNK.

Just so! Funk "recollects" that Hines was in Springfield and that he was "very busy." That implies that Funk saw him. What called Mr. Funk to Springfield, I wonder? What business called the general manager of the International Harvester Company to Springfield at the time when he saw Edward Hines "very busy pulling wires for the election of Senator Lorimer?"

Edward Hines was not in Springfield, Illinois, for fully five years prior to the election of Senator Lorimer.

Edward Hines did not go to Springfield until called before the Helm Committee to refute lies which had been circulated against him. This was about a year and a half after the election of Senator Lorimer.

Note how cock-sure Funk was in making this false statement. Not for an instant did he hesitate to hold Edward Hines up to scorn as a wealthy briber, pulling corrupt wires in Springfield and heaping dishonor on the great State of Illinois. Ten thousand newspapers printed and reprinted this and more wretched falsehoods against Mr. Hines.

I ask the reader to read carefully every line of what follows. It impeaches Clarence S. Funk as a witness and crumbles the foundation on which has been reared a structure of misrepresentation, suppression, falsehood and open perjury.

Clarence S. Funk appeared before the Helm Committee in Springfield on April 5, 1911. This was less than seven weeks after the publication of the Kohlsaats editorial in the Chicago Record-Herald, which was inspired by disclosures said to have been made by Funk to Kohlsaats. A trained business man—as Funk is presumed to be—capable of acting as general manager of a great corporation, should be able to verify from memory or by reference to data any important happening occurring within a period of seven weeks. Funk was the admitted sponsor of a tale certain to ruin the reputation of Edward Hines and to unseat Senator Lorimer—provided he was able to offer proof of its truth. Funk had told the story of the alleged infamy of Hines to H. H. Kohlsaats about a year before the latter gave a hint of it in the famous editorial of February 15, 1911. Funk admitted on the stand that the public would be compelled to weigh his affirmation against Mr. Hines in the scale of veracity—that it would be his word against that of the man he accused. I shall give the public a chance to do some accurate weighing.

One would think that if Edward Hines again approached Clarence S. Funk and again referred in any way to the corrupting of the Illinois Legislature and his participation in it—one would think, I say, that the astute Mr. Funk would take good care that witnesses observed the coming or going of the said corrupt Hines, and that every possible detail pertaining to the interview be subject to verification.

It presupposes that Funk was not a fool, that he was awake

and in his right mind when the alleged second interview with Hines occurred.

FUNK TELLS HIS STORY.

I will now let Clarence S. Funk tell his story of the alleged second conference with Edward Hines. I quote it from the official record of the hearings before the Helm Committee, on April 5, 1911:

QUESTION. You remember, do you not, Mr. Funk, the publication of an editorial in the Chicago Record-Herald, on or about the month of February, 1911, in which there was a specific reference to a \$100,000 corruption fund?

MR. FUNK. I don't think I saw the editorial at that time.

QUESTION. Did you see Mr. Hines about that time?

MR. FUNK. Yes; Mr. Hines came to my office in a day or two, or a short time; it may have been more than a day or two, but a short time after that editorial appeared.

QUESTION. What conversation did you have with him upon that occasion?

MR. FUNK. Well, he was very much disturbed at that time and undertook to refresh my memory as to what our conversation had been.

QUESTION. What did he say?

MR. FUNK. Well, I cannot repeat his language exactly, but in substance it was to the effect that his former conversation with me had been merely a general discussion of the situation down there, and that he had not asked me for any money, and that he did not know anything about any money having been raised.

QUESTION. Well, had you had any prior conversation with him in which you accused him of having raised any money?

MR. FUNK. No.

QUESTION. Or being concerned with any fund of that sort?

MR. FUNK. No.

QUESTION. You had not communicated with him in any way about that time?

MR. FUNK. No, sir.

QUESTION. And did he pretend to have any other business or any other thing to discuss with you when he came to your office in February, 1911?

MR. FUNK. No.

QUESTION. Was that the first time you had seen him after this Union League conversation?

MR. FUNK. Yes.

QUESTION. Nearly two years before that time, was it not?

MR. FUNK. No; I am mistaken about that. That was not

the first time I had seen him, perhaps. I may have seen him half a dozen times in the Union League Club or on the street or on the train, as men see each other, but I do not recall of having had any conversation in the interval.

QUESTION. You had never discussed this matter?

MR. FUNK. No; never.

QUESTION. So you had never discussed with him the matter of the existence of that corruption fund after the Union League Club meeting, which occurred in May or June, 1909, until about the time of the publication in the Record-Herald, which was some time in February, 1911?

MR. FUNK. No.

QUESTION. How long did this second conversation with Mr. Hines at your office last?

MR. FUNK. Oh, not over five minutes.

The above questions and answers cover everything of importance concerning this incident, as volunteered by Funk to the Helm Committee. I ask the reader to note that the alleged interview is positively fixed in February, 1911, and a day or two or a very few days after the publication of the editorial, which date was February 15. No one save Funk is alleged to have overheard this interview, no one saw Mr. Hines come or go—the tale is supported only by the word of Funk. Watch it fall!

The astounding story told by Funk attained for the enemies of Senator Lorimer the object dear to their hearts—a second investigation of his election to the U. S. Senate.

Mr. Clarence S. Funk appeared before the Dillingham Senatorial Committee in Washington on June 26, 1911. He had had more than two months to refresh his memory and produce a witness or witnesses who would help substantiate his remarkable story. He was not unaware that his story had created the greatest sensation ever known in Illinois politics. He was not unaware that he would be subjected to a rigid cross-examination. He knew that, if he knew anything—and I am not questioning his mental qualities.

FUNK FIXES THE DATE.

Mr. Funk was examined by Mr. Marble, the attorney for the committee, who did all he could to lead his witness in easy

paths. Mr. Marble tried to get Funk to fix the date of the alleged second interview between himself and Hines. I call your attention to this:

MR. MARBLE. Assuming that the Record-Herald editorial was printed on the 15th of February, 1911, when would you say that conversation was held?

MR. FUNK. I think it was a short time after that.

MR. MARBLE. How long?

MR. FUNK. I can not say how long.

QUESTION. A month or two months or three or what?

MR. FUNK. No; I do not think it was three months nor two.

"No, I do not think it was three months nor two," swears Funk before the committee. He surely was on safe ground. In former testimony he had positively limited the alleged date to the fourteen remaining days of February. See his testimony before the Helm Committee. He gave that testimony less than seven weeks from the date on which Hines is alleged to have pleaded with him. I would hardly characterize Mr. Funk as the highest type of an accurate witness. I now ask the reader to follow closely the testimony given by the man responsible for the slandering of Edward Hines.

Here is the essence of the story sworn to by Clarence S. Funk before the Dillingham Senatorial Committee:

MR. FUNK. Mr. Hines arrived at my office one morning shortly after I got there, about 9 o'clock, and he was admitted to my room. He seemed to be greatly agitated, and he immediately began to talk with me about our former conversation.

MR. MARBLE. What did he say?

MR. FUNK. I can not repeat it verbatim; but in substance he undertook to refresh my memory as to what our previous conversation had been.

MR. MARBLE. As near as you can, give what he said.

SENATOR KERN. It is important that we should have the substance of the conversation if you can not remember the exact words.

MR. FUNK. The substance of it was that he did not want me to misunderstand our talk the other day; that he had not meant to say that any money was used, but that he was only discussing with me in a general way the situation down there; and that he got to thinking about it afterwards and thought I

might not have understood it, and he was back there to clear it up.

A CRAZY THEORY.

Can you imagine a sane man doing the thing of which Funk accuses Edward Hines? If he were guilty of the Union League Club conversation what could he hope to gain by pleading with the man who had already exposed him? If guilty, Hines was forced to recognize in Funk a man determined to hold him up to public disgrace and scorn. Only an abject idiot would go to Funk with such a plea as the latter places in the mouth of Hines. On the contrary, if Hines were not guilty of the alleged Union League Club confession, how in the name of common sense would he have been alarmed over the mention of a \$100,000 bribery fund in the Record-Herald? Note that Funk refers to the second alleged conference as having occurred "the other day." Nearly two years must have elapsed, but inaccuracy or carelessness of statement is chronic with those responsible for the campaign of slander against Edward Hines.

I next call the attention of the reader to the following testimony:

MR. MARBLE. Had you read the Record-Herald editorial?

MR. FUNK. No; I had not.

MR. MARBLE. Did he (Hines) draw it to your attention?

MR. FUNK. No.

SENATOR KERN. What fixed it in your mind, or why do you connect this conversation with the Record-Herald editorial, if you had not read it?

MR. FUNK. Because a day or two after Mr. Hines' visit the editorial came to my desk, marked, with a lot of other clippings, and I noted that it had been printed prior to his coming. That caught my attention, because it came to me in that way.

SENATOR GAMBLE. That, then, was the first time you had seen the editorial?

MR. FUNK. I had not seen it prior to that.

SENATOR GAMBLE. And your interview with Mr. Hines was how long before you saw the editorial in the Record-Herald?

MR. FUNK. I can not fix that definitely, Senator. I am frequently behind in my work, and I read bundles of clippings and editorials—sometimes a large number of them at one time.

I remember when I read the editorial that it occurred to me that I saw the reason for the visit.

One does not need be a Sherlock Holmes to help Mr. Funk fix the alleged date on which Mr. Hines called on him at his office, assuming for the moment that Mr. Hines did make such a call. If we take it for granted that all of Mr. Funk's testimony about Hines was true, that he made the criminal confession at the Union League Club in 1909, and that he came to the office of Mr. Funk on account of the Record-Herald editorial of February 15, 1911, I submit that it was a certainty that Mr. Hines—if interested—would have seen that editorial before he finished his breakfast.

Mr. Funk states that Mr. Hines arrived at an early hour on the morning of that unknown date, and that "he seemed to be considerably agitated." I take it that no reasonable man can imagine Edward Hines rushing into Mr. Funk's private office "considerably agitated" *twenty days* after the appearance of the Record-Herald editorial. If any such interview ever occurred the date was at least twenty days after that famous editorial was published. Why?

The Record-Herald editorial hinting at a \$100,000 corruption fund was published on February 15, 1911. EDWARD HINES WAS NOT IN CHICAGO FROM FEBRUARY 7, TO MARCH 5, 1911.

THE SIMPLE STORY OF AN ALIBI.

If the above statement be true, Clarence S. Funk has no standing as the accuser of Edward Hines and is totally discredited as a witness. *The proof is absolute that Edward Hines was not in Chicago during the period fixed by Funk for the second incriminating interview.*

When a petty thief or a low criminal of the ordinary type sets up the defense of an alibi and attempts to establish it by the testimony of creatures of his class, a jury may properly decline to be influenced by such alleged alibi. But when the leading lumberman of the United States, the master mind of a score

of huge enterprises, a director of one of the great banks of the world, asserts that he was not in Chicago for a certain period of time, one may be reasonably certain that the truth of his statement may readily be proved or disproved.

Mr. Hines left Chicago for Washington on February 7, 1911. He did not return to Chicago until March 5, leaving Washington with Mrs. Hines on March 4, the closing day of that session of Congress.

Mrs. Hines joined Mr. Hines in Washington on February 11 and remained with him until Congress adjourned on March 4. Mr. and Mrs. Hines occupied a suite of rooms at the New Willard Hotel in Washington. Witnesses of high character and of national reputation gave testimony which proved that Mr. Hines could not have been in Chicago during that period. There was introduced in evidence a mass of documentary evidence which absolutely proved the whereabouts of Mr. Hines during every day of this important period. This evidence included the hotel bills fully itemized, telephone and telegraph bills, receipts for theatre tickets, railroad and Pullman tickets, laundry bills, etc. I might offer the scores of telegrams proving that Mr. Hines was in Washington keeping in close touch with his Chicago business affairs every day, but what's the use? Those who have any lingering doubt on this matter can consult the record. There is no more question of the whereabouts of Edward Hines during that period than there is of the movements of President Taft.

WHAT MR. HINES WAS DOING.

From February 8 to March 4 Edward Hines was never within nine hundred miles of Funk's office. As a lumberman, Mr. Hines felt that his interests were menaced by the pending Reciprocity Bill. He was busy in and near Washington practically every moment of the day and often long into the hours of the night. He met hundreds of men of affairs, kept in constant touch with his business subordinates and associates in Chicago and elsewhere, became a well known figure in Washington, was frequently mentioned by the press correspondents

as being in Washington, yet we are asked by Funk to believe that Edward Hines was suddenly translated from Washington to Chicago and that he came cringing to Funk because of an editorial in the Chicago Record-Herald.

Edward Hines never saw the editorial in question until long after Funk had made public his grotesque accusation against him. He would not have given it a moment's thought had someone called it to his attention. It meant nothing to Edward Hines. It was no more false or malicious than scores of other slanders against Lorimer which had appeared in Chicago papers.

Mark the astounding malignity of what follows: Funk swears that Edward Hines came to his office in Chicago on or shortly after February 15, 1911, and attempted to cover up his criminal tracks. Funk had told the tale to Kohlsaas and Kohlsaas had magnified it and exposed it to Senators Root, La Follette and others. A week or so later we find Funk in Washington. On March 4 we find Funk begging of Edward Hines that the latter use his influence to secure the upright Funk a seat in the Senate gallery, and we find the unsuspecting and good natured Hines going out of his way to grant a favor to the man who a few weeks later was to brand him with infamy! How would that sound in a novel?

What next do we see? On March 4 the Congressional session is ended. Mr. and Mrs. Hines and Funk return to Chicago on the same train. The scene is in the dining car. Funk approaches the table occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Hines, stands there and chats affably for several minutes. He is profuse in his thanks to Mr. Hines for the favor of a seat in the Senate gallery. *Before the month was ended Funk had branded Edward Hines as the collector of a bribery fund raised and disbursed nearly two years before.*

The astounding thing, the utterly bewildering thing is that it was possible for a time to educate the American people to

believe the unsubstantiated word of a Funk and to turn a deaf ear to the proof produced by the man he has wronged.

SHADES OF CHARLES DICKENS!

I find that I have omitted one of the finest parts of the testimony of Mr. Funk concerning his recollections of what took place during the alleged second interview with Mr. Hines. I quote from Page 558 of the official record:

SENATOR LEA. Did you agree with Mr. Hines as to his recollection or interpretation of the former conversation?

MR. FUNK. No, sir.

SENATOR LEA. Did you express dissent?

MR. FUNK. My recollection is that I told him that I thought I remembered the thing as it was. I disposed of him as quickly as I could, because, as I remember, we were having a directors' meeting that morning, or a conference of some kind, which was of considerable importance, and they were waiting for me. And I got rid of him and left the room as soon as I could. I do not think he was in the office more than three minutes.

What a vivid picture! We see the righteous Funk listening with disdain to the frightened and cringing Hines, scorning to accept his miserable excuses, impatient to get rid of him, and, besides, "we were having a directors' meeting which was of considerable importance, *and they were waiting for me.*"

Ah, Charles Dickens, you should have known Funk!

Instead of cowering and cringing before the salaried employee of the Harvester Company, Mr. Edward Hines was in Washington and New York, engaged in conferences with men of affairs. Instead of trying to "refresh the memory" of Clarence S. Funk concerning an event of which Mr. Hines had no knowledge and from which he had nothing to fear, Mr. Hines was mingling with great bankers and greeting as equals the heads of great industries and institutions.

The reader must bear in mind that Clarence S. Funk gave his testimony before the Dillingham Committee several days before Edward Hines took the stand and established the fact that he was not in Chicago on any day near the time specified by Funk in his testimony. I have no way of knowing if Funk yet realizes that Mr. Hines has established the most complete

alibi ever presented in a case which has attracted national attention. Possibly Mr. Funk is not yet aware of what stands on the records. He is not aware of it if he has confined his study of the case to the evidence as reported in the press. I can find no newspaper which has set forth the plain import of that evidence. The public is absolutely without knowledge of the facts which I have just disclosed—facts which reveal Clarence S. Funk as a man who has either substituted falsehood for fact, or which stamp him as a witness with a memory incapable of retaining the essential details entering into a famous case, of which he is the accusing principal.

Since the proof is absolute that Mr. Hines was not in or near Chicago on any date in the period fixed by Mr. Funk for the alleged conference brought about by the Record-Herald editorial of February 15, 1911, Mr. Funk will have to refresh his memory and fix some new date. I presume he will be unable to change the date of the editorial. This does not depend on his memory. He cannot set any date after March 1, 1911. Funk and Hines were both in Washington on or about that date, and Senator Lorimer received a vindication from the Senate in that week. Only a few weeks passed before Funk told his story before the Helm Committee.

I am mildly curious to learn how Mr. Funk will reconcile his story of his second alleged interview with the complete alibi established by Mr. Hines. Possibly he will set it ahead of the publication of the Record-Herald editorial. In fact, I see no other alternative. This would be embarrassing to most witnesses, but—for a man occupying his position—Mr. Funk can plead possession of a most peculiar memory.

THE ONLY HONEST MAN.

I have never been able to understand why Mr. Hines should have assumed that the Record-Herald editorial was inspired by Clarence S. Funk. Of course, the theory is that Funk was the only man who knew of the guilt of Hines, but I can find no basis for such a theory.

Are we to assume that Funk was the only man who declined to contribute? That assumption is an awful slur on

the integrity of Chicago millionaires. I cannot imagine a grosser insult than to assume that such a fund could be raised in Chicago with only one rebuff to the collector.

But we must admit that this is what happened, if we are to assume that Funk was the only man who was in a position to expose Edward Hines, and that is what we are asked to believe. Then we must assume that Funk is the only honest capitalist of Hines' acquaintance. Then we must take it for granted that none of the other men criminally approached by Edward Hines declined to participate in the corruption of the Legislature of Illinois.

I see no flaw in that logic. Any honest man thus approached would have gone before the investigating committee and exposed Edward Hines. There were no honest men approached—Funk alone excepted. We are asked to believe that Funk alone has stood the brunt, that Funk alone has stood between the people of a great commonwealth and the debauching of its legislature!

Surely, Illinois had a narrow escape!

In a labored editorial summing up the results of the second investigation, the Chicago Tribune, under date of November 23, has this to say:

The testimony of Mr. Funk that Mr. Hines asked him for a contribution of \$10,000, the testimony which when given to the Illinois senate investigating committee resulted in the reopening of the case by the United States senate, is supported by Mr. McCormick, Mr. Kohlsaat and Mr. Bancroft, to whom his story was told before the first investigation was ended—a story which was not produced then and which came out only on compulsion.

How is Funk's statement supported by Mr. McCormick, Mr. Kohlsaat or by Mr. Bancroft? How do these gentlemen know that Mr. Hines asked Funk to contribute \$10,000 or ten cents? They have testified to nothing of the kind, and right well the Chicago Tribune knows it. These gentlemen have attempted to repeat what Funk told them. What of it? The question is: "Did Funk tell them the truth?" Mr. Funk might have told them that Mr. Hines confessed to having

blown up the Maine—and might have believed it. Doubtless the Chicago Tribune would have accepted the word of Funk for that accusation—provided Senator Lorimer could have been smirched by it—but no court would convict Mr. Hines because of it.

There is not an editor in the country so misinformed as not to know that the self-serving statements of Funk, testified to by McCormick, Bancroft and Kohlsaatt, would not be admitted in evidence by any court in the land.

I repeat that there is not a word of evidence substantiating the charge made by Clarence S. Funk. There is a mountain of fact and a host of reliable witnesses in disproof of his vague and conflicting statements and alleged recollections.

Thus far I have confined myself to a brief consideration of facts and allegations brought out by sworn testimony given by witnesses before the various investigating committees. I now call attention to a most significant fact.

Mr. Funk testifies that he informed Mr. Cyrus McCormick and Mr. Edgar A. Bancroft that Mr. Edward Hines had asked him to contribute to the reimbursing of a \$100,000 fund. He testifies that Mr. McCormick expressed great satisfaction that he (Funk) had repulsed Hines, also that Mr. Bancroft endorsed his refusal thus to contribute.

HOW ABOUT THIS?

The International Harvester Company was a regular customer of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, purchasing large quantities of lumber from it. Clarence S. Funk was and still is the general manager of that company. According to his alleged disclosures he knew of Mr. Hines' guilt on the day following the election of Senator Lorimer. He still knew of it during the time when the Burrows committee was conducting the first investigation of the Lorimer charges. Funk's office was only a few doors from the building in which that investigation was being conducted. He walked or rode past it every day. He was in possession of alleged facts which, if

substantiated, would unseat Lorimer and head Edward Hines for the penitentiary. Yet Funk said no word.

He makes the excuse that he did not desire to implicate himself or his company in such a distressing scandal. Well and good! One would think, however, that the virtuous Mr. Funk might have deemed it proper to terminate business relations with such a man as is pictured by the Funk testimony. Did Mr. Funk take this highly proper step?

Not a bit of it. The International Harvester Company continued a customer of the Edward Hines Lumber Company from the date of the alleged Union League interview between Edward Hines and Clarence S. Funk, alleged to have occurred on or about May 27, 1909, until after April 5, 1911, on which date Clarence S. Funk told his incriminating story before the Helm Committee.

The books of the Edward Hines Lumber Company prove this. The books of the International Harvester Company prove this. Clarence S. Funk admitted it under oath when before the Dillingham Committee on June 26, 1911, more than two years after Hines is alleged to have insulted Funk with a corrupt proposal. In answer to a question propounded by Mr. Marble, official prosecutor of the committee, Funk thus testified on June 26, 1911:

MR. FUNK. "Our purchasing department, which is under a manager who is largely held responsible, and who does not report to me the details of his transactions, ARE PURCHASING LUMBER FROM THE HINES LUMBER COMPANY, AND HAVE BEEN FOR A GOOD WHILE, in the open market, as they are purchasing from probably a dozen other people."

Note that Funk attempts to shift the responsibility to a department under his control. But Funk knew all about it. His words as above quoted prove that he was aware of it, and also prove that he had no objection to dealings with Edward Hines.

I shall let the reader place his own construction on this remarkable fact, which is this: *Clarence S. Funk continued*

for nearly two years to patronize a man whom he later branded with one of the most heinous crimes in the calendar.

BRUTAL UNFAIRNESS OF PROSECUTION.

The brutal unfairness of those responsible for the maligning of Edward Hines is strikingly shown by the treatment accorded him by the Helm Committee. Mr. Healy, the prosecuting attorney, asked if he would be permitted to make an examination of the books, bank accounts and records of Edward Hines and of the Edward Hines Lumber Company. Mr. Hines unhesitatingly granted that request. Mr. Healy went to Chicago and made an examination. He found no trace of wrong doing, and admitted so to Mr. Hines, but explained that he was not a qualified expert in such matters.

Mr. Hines then asked Mr. Healy to select any firm of registered accountants, Mr. Hines pledging himself to give them unlimited scope and authority to examine his accounts in all of the banks in which he or his firm maintained deposits. Mr. Hines also offered to defray the considerable expense of such examination. Mr. Healy did not accept this offer, and left stating that he was personally satisfied and would so report to the Helm Committee.

Day after day passed with no mention of this finding by Mr. Healy, the Helm Committee or the press. Instead of this concrete evidence of the innocence of Edward Hines the papers were filled with the grotesque lies invented by irresponsible correspondents and alleged investigators. Finally, on May 11, 1911, Mr. C. F. Wiehe, secretary of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, sent the following telegram to J. J. Healy, attorney of the Helm Committee:

J. J. HEALY, *Attorney for Helm Committee, Leland Hotel, Springfield, Ill:*

Understand Helm committee has met since your investigation of the books and checks issued by Edward Hines Lumber Co., Edward Hines, and C. F. Wiehe, but that you have been entirely silent as to your findings. In all fairness and in justice to us and our associated companies, do you not think the results of your findings should be reported to Helm committee and made public?

I have as yet received no reply to this telegram and would be pleased to have you advise me if your committee has received this report. C. F. WIEHE.

Two tracers were sent after this telegram, but the recipient made no response. On May 13, the following telegram was sent to Mr. Healy and repeated to the Hon. D. W. Helm:

JOHN J. HEALY, *Attorney for Helm Committee, Leland Hotel, Springfield, Ill:*

Understand Helm committee have met since your investigation of the books and checks issued by Edward Hines Lumber Co., Edward Hines, and C. F. Wiehe, but that you have been entirely silent as to your findings. In all fairness and in justice to us and our associated companies, do you not think the result of your findings should be reported to Helm committee and made public? C. F. WIEHE.

No replies were received to these telegrams, but the records of the telegraph company prove that these messages were delivered. The committee adjourned without giving to the public a hint of the truth about the investigation made by Attorney Healy, who also represented the Helm Committee. Later an obscure item was inserted in its official report, but the anti-Lorimer press ignored it.

A CRUSHING BLOW.

It was not until November 22, 1911, the closing day of the session of the Dillingham Committee in Chicago, that the prosecution received a crushing blow, and the public received direct confirmation of the innocence of Edward Hines. Care was taken that there should be no suppression of the facts concerning a new and most thorough examination of the books and records of Mr. Hines and of the great enterprises of which he is the head.

The Dillingham Committee had ordered such an investigation. For months the prosecution had insisted that a proper examination of the books and of the bank transactions conducted by Edward Hines would reveal the fact of dishonest complicity in the election of William Lorimer. To ascertain if these rumors had foundation, the investigating committee selected the most famous firm of chartered accountants in the

United States, and Chairman Dillingham gave them instructions to make a most rigid examination, not only of the records of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, but of all of its subsidiary or controlled companies, some of them located in remote parts of Michigan and Wisconsin, and still further, an exhaustive examination of the private records of Edward Hines as an individual.

Experts in the employ of Barrow, Wade, Guthrie & Company spent four or five weeks in a minute and most searching study of these books and records, and made a report which establishes the honesty of Edward Hines in the minds of those business men who know that it is impossible to cover up crooked transactions under modern systems of bookkeeping, subject to modern investigations by chartered accountants. I now quote the essential features of this exonerating report:

BARROW, WADE, GUTHRIE & CO.

(Established in U. S. 1883.)

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS AND CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS.

Broad Exchange Building,

25 Broad Street,

NEW YORK, NOV. 1, 1911.

HON. W. P. DILLINGHAM,

United States Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, investigating the election of Mr. William Lorimer as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hand you herewith my report on the following matters which I investigated under instructions received from you, viz:

(a) Accounts of the Edward Hines Lumber Company and its subsidiary or controlled companies, including the personal accounts of Mr. Edward Hines.

(b) Certain personal records of Mr. Edward Hines.

The purpose of the examination of the books and accounts of the above company was to determine, if possible, what part, if any, this company had in the collection or disbursement of the fund alleged to have been raised in connection with the election of Mr. William Lorimer to the United States Senate in May, 1909.

In addition to the accounts of the Edward Hines Lumber Company proper, my examination embraced the accounts of the following branches and companies owned or controlled by it, viz:

Edward Hines Lumber Company... Vessel Department,
 " ... Lumberman's Mill Company,
 " ... Wood Street Planing Mill,
 " ... Evanston Branch,
 " ... Glenview Branch,
 " ... Rosehill Branch,
 " ... Cusson Logging Operations,
 North Wisconsin Lumber & Manufacturing Company,
 Hayward Mercantile Company,
 First National Bank, Hayward, Wisconsin,
 Mason State Bank, Mason, Wisconsin,
 White River Lumber Company,
 Iron River Lumber Company,
 Virginia & Rainy Lake Company.

I was also granted access to the personal books of Mr. Edward Hines for the year ending December 31, 1909.

As a result of my examination of the books of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, and the personal books of Mr. Edward Hines for the entire year ending December 31, 1909, and of the books of the various branches and subsidiary or controlled companies (as hereinbefore enumerated) for the nine months from April 1, 1909, to December 31, 1909, I am able to report as follows:

- (a) That there was no evidence of the Edward Hines Lumber Company or any of its subsidiary or controlled companies having received or disbursed any moneys in connection with the election of Mr. William Lorimer, on May 26, 1909, to the United States Senate from the State of Illinois.
- (b) That there was no evidence of Mr. Edward Hines as an individual having received or disbursed any moneys in connection with the aforesaid election.

In order to ascertain whether or not Mr. Hines might have negotiated a loan from one or other of the banks in Chicago with which he was connected, or with which he had business relations, I visited the following banks and trust companies:

Continental National Bank,
 Hiberian Banking Association,
 Fort Dearborn National Bank,
 Northern Trust Company,
 Corn Exchange National Bank,
 Metropolitan Trust & Savings Bank.

At each of these banks I examined their record of notes discounted during the last week of May, 1909, and the first part of June, 1909.

I am able to report, therefore, that at none of these banks, in the period under review, did Mr. Hines discount any note or notes, either as drawer or as endorser. . . .

Yours very truly,

ALFRED A. RITCHIE.

Reduced to plain and brief English, the following conclusion must be derived from the report just quoted, viz:

The most reliable firm of chartered accountants in the United States, after a most exhaustive examination of the records of each and every concern with which Edward Hines was connected, or with which he transacted business, found not the slightest trace of wrong doing during the entire period covered by the unfounded charges which have been made against him.

WHY DID FUNK ACCUSE HINES?

The testimony acquits Edward Hines, but there still remains a mystery which puzzles the fair-minded student of this case, viz: "What impelled Funk to give his astounding testimony?"

Clarence S. Funk undoubtedly had a fixed purpose in opening negotiations with Mr. Hines. He was attempting to execute a mission for which he was peculiarly fitted. He doubtless realized that it was high time to end the feud between the Harvester company and Mr. Lorimer. The elevation of the latter to the Senatorship indicated to Funk that there was no longer a chance to carry out the scheme of closing the Chicago River. That question was settled. The friction arising from that ancient dispute had made of Congressman Lorimer an enemy. It was advisable—in Funk's opinion—to conciliate Senator Lorimer, and, if possible, win his friendship and co-operation. How would he go about this? By offering to reimburse a portion of Senator Lorimer's campaign expenses.

Funk, experienced in practical politics, doubtless imagined that a considerable sum of money had been expended in the election of Senator Lorimer. He doubtless assumed that this money had been contributed by "friendly interests." He there-

fore presumably made a move intended to align his corporation with those whom he imagined were entitled to the friendship of the new Senator from Illinois.

It is fair to presume that he took the preliminary step without consulting his superior officers. He did not know Senator Lorimer, hence could not treat with him personally. Funk was aware that Edward Hines was the personal friend of Lorimer. Funk and Hines met accidentally in the Union League Club the day following the election of Senator Lorimer. Funk's version of what was said between them is disproved either by witnesses or by every known fact which enters into a fair consideration of this case. The account given by Mr. Hines rings true, and is verified by competent evidence, documentary and personal.

Mr. Hines assumed that Funk was anxious to ascertain if any money had been *legitimately* expended. The lumber merchant promised to ascertain and to report to Mr. Funk. Funk may have mistaken this for a tacit act of encouragement. The International Harvester Company was a large purchaser of lumber from the company headed by Mr. Hines. The latter naturally desired to maintain friendly business relations with Funk, its new general manager. He therefore agreed to introduce Mr. Funk to the new Senator, and Mr. Hines doubtless imagined he might be instrumental in winning for Mr. Lorimer a friend in place of an enemy.

It is a matter of record that Mr. Funk later volunteered a version of his interview with Mr. Hines to Mr. Cyrus McCormick, the President of the International Harvester Company, but it does not follow that this was a frank or accurate version.

Mr. McCormick's testimony is to the effect that Mr. Funk gave him the impression that Edward Hines had solicited a contribution to a fund which should reimburse money already expended in the election of William Lorimer. It may be taken for granted that Mr. McCormick, to the best of his recollection, quotes Funk according to the impression then received, *but that proves nothing against Edward Hines*. Herman H. Kohl-

saat swears that Funk told him that Roger Sullivan, E. S. Conway and one of the Weyerhaeusers each contributed \$10,000 to this alleged Lorimer fund. It is known that these gentlemen did nothing of the kind. The question is: "What motive had Clarence S. Funk in asserting to Cyrus McCormick that Edward Hines had solicited a contribution in behalf of Senator Lorimer?"

Had I been in Mr. Funk's place, deeming it a part of my official duty to initiate negotiations intended to placate a powerful political enemy of a great corporation, I might have opened the subject with my official superior by informing him that a personal friend of the victorious politician had made a covert suggestion that it might be well to take such steps as would convert an enemy into a friend. Assuming that I were engaged in that sort of business, and also assuming that my corporation superior did not indicate a desire to be a party to such negotiations, I might then assert that such was my attitude, and that I had so informed and rebuked the misguided go-between who had dared approach me.

I would probably be sagacious enough to repeat this alleged version to a friend, taking proper credit for my stern virtue. Thus I would fortify myself with my employers, pose as a man of spotless morality and executive firmness with my friends, all of whom would later be able to come forward and testify that I had related the alleged happening to them in strict confidence.

Therefore, it is entirely possible that Clarence S. Funk informed Cyrus McCormick that he had been approached by Edward Hines, and that Mr. Funk made this statement not for the purpose of implicating the lumberman or exposing a corrupt Lorimer conspiracy, but for the diplomatic purpose of ascertaining if his official superior would be willing to take action likely to win the favor, or, at least, the neutrality of the newly elected Senator from Illinois.

Charles S. Funk's self-serving declarations may also have been intended to defend himself against the possible mention by Mr. Hines of the proposition made by Funk in the Union

League Club. This explains why Funk continued to buy lumber from Mr. Hines.

MOTIVE FOR PERSECUTION OF HINES.

All fair-minded students of this remarkable case are now aware that Edward Hines was marked as the victim of a conspiracy. The startling exposure of the plot engineered by employees of the Burns Detective Agency opened the eyes of the public to the methods used to implicate honest witnesses. When the leading stenographic experts of the United States testified under oath before the Dillingham Committee that Detective Sheridan's shorthand notes were spurious and that a palpable fraud had been attempted, and when it was proved that the detectives used for that purpose were hired by the Chicago Tribune, a flood of light was thrown on this case and a glimpse of its depravity revealed.

But why was Edward Hines selected as the victim?

Having invented the charge that a \$100,000 bribery fund had been raised and disbursed it was next in order to name the agent. It was the misfortune of Edward Hines that he had incurred the hostility of certain of the enemies of William Lorimer, and this circumstance doubtless influenced the conspirators to charge Mr. Hines with offenses now disproved. Many reasons impelled the clique to make this selection.

The conspirators knew that Mr. Hines was a personal friend of William Lorimer. They knew that he had been instrumental—in a perfectly legitimate way—in the election of Senator Lorimer. They knew and resented the fact that Mr. Hines had been active in thwarting the attempt to unseat Senator Lorimer. They knew that Mr. Hines, as executive head of the lumber industry, aided in defeating a tariff measure which would have placed wood pulp on the free list, thus curtailing the profits and incurring the added hatred of the Chicago Tribune. It was also unfortunate for Mr. Hines that he was not an advertiser in that newspaper.

These and other reasons suggested to the conspirators the attempt to smirch the name of Edward Hines. For a time

their success was astounding, appalling! They have demonstrated that no individual however upright, no reputation however clean, is safe against conspiracy backed by unprincipled journalism.

**THE FAMOUS KOHLSAAT LETTERS AND THE NEW LIGHT THEY
THROW ON THE CONSPIRACY TO WRECK THE
REPUTATION OF EDWARD HINES.**

Herman H. Kohlsaatt, then nominally the editor of the Chicago Record-Herald, gave his testimony before the Dillingham Committee on June 24, 1911. He was not quite so patronizing as when he appeared before the Helm Committee in Springfield on March 29, 1911, but still seemed to assume that his unsupported word should and would be accepted without question by the august Senators privileged to hear him. He little imagined that his testimony would result in striking his name from the editorial page of the Record-Herald.

He did not dream that his friend, Clarence S. Funk, would on the following day deny under oath many of the essential statements then sworn to by him. It is not likely that Mr. Kohlsaatt then realized that letters written by him to Senators Root, Crane, Cullom and La Follette would later repudiate much of his sworn testimony.

With these letters before us it is now possible to obtain a fair perspective of a grotesque feature of this remarkable case, and it is possible to analyze the conflicting and contradictory testimony given by the twin accusers of Edward Hines—Clarence S. Funk and Herman H. Kohlsaatt.

The fact that Kohlsaatt had written letters to various Senators of the United States prior to the vote on the Lorimer charges in the U. S. Senate, was brought out in Mr. Kohlsaatt's testimony of June 24, 1911, and he was ordered to turn copies of such letters and their answers to the Dillingham Committee. He promised to do so without delay, but it was not until January 8, 1912, that the public was permitted to know the contents of these confidential communications to Senators who then were sitting in judgment on the right of Senator Lorimer to retain his seat and to vindicate his honor.

One has only to read these letters to understand the reluctance of Mr. Kohlsaas to turn them over to the committee.

THE GROSS OFFENSE COMMITTED BY KOHLSAAS.

Some time in May or June, 1910, Funk and Kohlsaas met by accident or design, and both agree that Funk told Kohlsaas something which reflected on the conduct of Edward Hines relative to the election of Senator Lorimer. What actually was said by Funk at that time will never be known. His version conflicts with that later repeated by Kohlsaas. Neither version agrees with the undisputed facts. Funk's story before the Helm Committee does not conform to his tale told to the Dillingham Committee. There were no witnesses to any interview between Funk and Kohlsaas, or between Funk and McCormick or Bancroft. Not a scrap of paper or a bit of affirmative evidence exists to prove that any such interview or interviews ever took place.

Funk swears that he narrated this tale to Kohlsaas in strict confidence, and that he assumed that Kohlsaas would respect that confidence and reveal neither the charges nor any of the names mentioned to any living person. Kohlsaas admits that he proceeded to tell the entire story to three persons, viz: Mr. Victor F. Lawson, Theodore Roosevelt and Mrs. H. H. Kohlsaas. Mr. Victor F. Lawson is the owner of the Chicago News and of the Chicago Record-Herald, and is also president of the Associated Press. We hear Kohlsaas informing the Senatorial Investigating Committee that this breach of confidence "influenced his (Lawson's) editorial policy during the entire period of the Lorimer investigation."

Mr. Kohlsaas then told the story to James Keeley, managing editor of the Chicago Tribune and general-in-chief of the persecution of Senator Lorimer, but claims that he withheld Funk's name from Keeley. He admits that he told the same story to many others, that he was assiduous in secretly circulating a rumor calculated to ruin the reputation of Edward Hines, and without giving that gentleman the slightest chance to defend himself or to answer the innumerable slan-

ders which distilled from the exchange of gossip set about by the confidant of Clarence S. Funk.

A GENTLEMAN'S CODE.

It was a different matter, however, when Herman H. Kohlsaat made a systematic attempt to influence United States Senators who were sitting in judgment on the fate of William Lorimer. Each Senator acts as a judge. Common sense as well as common decency requires that all charges against a Senator under trial shall be made openly. It is as much of an affront on the part of a citizen to attempt to influence the vote of an individual Senator by the secret imparting of alleged information as it would be thus to address a member of the Supreme Court of the United States with similar intent.

On January 17, 1911, Herman H. Kohlsaat addressed a confidential letter to Senator Elihu Root, of New York, which will be considered somewhat in detail. This letter contained criminal charges against Edward Hines. Two months later Mr. Kohlsaat was called on by the Helm Committee to reveal these same alleged charges. He declined to do so. His moral and political code warranted him in addressing to a senatorial judge a letter making charges which he later admitted he could not sustain, and impelled him to deny to a duly constituted legislative committee a chance to investigate the truth or falsity of statements which Kohlsaat had sedulously circulated by word of mouth and by written communications. His plea was that he "would not betray a confidence." Let Funk testify how Kohlsaat respected that "confidence." I refer to page 553 of the government record of the proceedings of the Dillingham Committee:

SENATOR FLETCHER. Did you tell him (Kohlsaat) the whole story in confidence?

MR. FUNK. Yes, sir.

SENATOR JONES. Not only that he should treat the names of the individuals mentioned in confidence, but the other parts of the conversation?

MR. FUNK. The whole thing.

SENATOR JONES. That is, you understood from that that he was not to repeat any part of it to anyone else?

MR. FUNK. I simply told him that I gave him the information in confidence.

Carefully refraining from revealing the alleged Funk story to the Burrows Senatorial Committee, which held a prolonged session in Chicago, Herman H. Kohlsaas set about to poison the minds of certain United States Senators high in standing and influence in the greatest legislative body in the world.

THE EPISTLES OF KOHLSAAS.

I now proceed to consider these letters by paragraphs or sentences. The first letter was written to Senator Root, under date of January 17, 1911, and opened as follows:

"Chicago, Ill., Jan. 17, 1911.—Senator Elihu Root, Washington, D. C.—My Dear Senator: I have just received a call from some well known people here, among them Walter L. Fisher, asking me if I would not write you and tell of an incident in the Lorimer senatorial election. My friends thought that if you had this personal knowledge it would be of assistance to you in strengthening your belief that money was used to elect Lorimer. This information was given to me in confidence, and as a newspaper man I feel the same obligation to maintain secrecy that a priest does of a confession."

I submit that this is the most harsh insinuation ever made against the priesthood. It also ranks high as a bit of unconscious humor. No Irishman ever perpetrated a more perfect "bull" than that contained in the last quoted sentence from the letter written by Kohlsaas. The following is the manner in which he indicates that he feels that he had "the same obligation to maintain secrecy that a priest does of a confession":

"Some time last June I met a friend, who is general manager of a Chicago corporation with a capital of over \$25,000,000. He said: 'I have been intending to call on you for some days to tell you of an incident that occurred right after Lorimer's election a year ago.'"

This "friend," of course, was Clarence S. Funk. We glean from the above that Funk was eager to tell Kohlsaas all about this matter. Perhaps he was. I shall not attempt the

impossible task of reconciling the various conflicting statements made under oath by Funk and Kohlsaatz, and shall let the student make his own deductions concerning which one was at fault. In the quoted paragraph we glean that Funk was anxious to tell Kohlsaatz something. Let's see what Funk has to say about this. Turn to page 554 of the record:

MR. MARBLE. "Did you press any information on him?" (meaning Kohlsaatz).

MR. FUNK. "No, he pumped it out of me."

Who told the truth—Funk or Kohlsaatz? Mr. Kohlsaatz continues to quote Funk as follows to Senator Root:

"I had a visit from Edward Hines, the lumberman, and he told me that Lorimer's friends had the opportunity of electing him to the Senate by putting up \$100,000, that they had only a few days before the adjournment of the legislature and could not take the time to go around and raise the money, so half a dozen of Lorimer's friends underwrote the \$100,000 and gave it to the proper agent."

Possibly Mr. Funk told all this to Kohlsaatz, but startling parts of it never came before the committee. Funk failed to testify that he had any "visit" from Mr. Hines. It is agreed that they met accidentally at the Union League Club. Funk thus far has not sworn that Hines informed him that "half a dozen of Lorimer's friends underwrote the \$100,000 and gave it to the proper agent." The public obtained from Funk an impression that Hines put up the \$100,000 and was trying to get it back. We resume the written recollections of H. H. Kohlsaatz as disclosed to Senator Root:

"'Lorimer was elected, and we are now asking some of the corporations to pay in their share. I am taking care of the uptown district, and another man (mentioning the name) has charge of the stockyards. We figure that your share will be \$10,000.'"

This is what Hines said to Funk as narrated by Kohlsaatz to Senator Root. It is unfortunate that the information conveyed in the last paragraph never came before the committee.

Mr. Kohlsaas and Mr. Funk both failed to inform the Dillingham Committee of any such assertion on the part of Mr. Hines. Where did Kohlsaas get Tilden's name? Funk denies responsibility. Why did not Kohlsaas repeat this alleged information to the investigating committee before which he later appeared under oath?

Who told the truth—Funk or Kohlsaas?

DID FUNK SAY THIS?

Mr. Kohlsaas goes on to write:

"My friend (Funk) answered substantially as follows:

"I cannot give you any money for two reasons. First, we are not in that kind of business; and, second, if you have gotten yourselves in a hole, why should you expect us to pull you out?"

It is worthy of comment that the investigating committee has not yet been favored with this contribution to the Lorimer romance. We now come to a rather startling disclosure, which Mr. Kohlsaas can explain at his leisure. He thus addresses Senator Root:

"On the strength of this statement (the alleged statement by Funk to Kohlsaas) the Record-Herald has EXPLICITLY STATED SEVERAL TIMES THAT \$100,000 WAS RAISED TO BUY LORIMER'S ELECTION, and we never have had a protest from anybody on it."

Let's see about that. On February 15, 1911, there appeared an editorial in the Record-Herald mentioning \$100,000 as a sum of money alleged to have been raised and corruptly expended in the election of Senator Lorimer. It was this editorial which forced Funk—according to his own sworn testimony—to appear before the Helm Committee and make the first public exposure of the alleged admissions of Mr. Edward Hines. When Herman H. Kohlsaas was on the stand and under oath before the Dillingham Committee on June 24, 1911, the editorial of February 15 was submitted in evidence and this question was asked Mr. Kohlsaas:

MR. MARBLE. "Was that the editorial or newspaper refer-

ence which you made to the substance of this communication by Mr. Funk?"

MR. KOHLSAAT. "That was the first editorial in which any sum of money was specified?"

SENATOR FLETCHER. "It was based on that conversation with Mr. Funk?"

MR. KOHLSAAT. "Yes."

Again, on page 452, we find this from Mr. Kohlsaatt in flat denial of what he had written to Senator Root on January 17, 1911:

MR. KOHLSAAT. "I had hints of all kinds, but never mentioned the \$100,000 in editorials for several months previous. I never had before mentioned a sum of money."

Yet we read in Kohlsaatt's letter to Senator Root, written nearly a month before the famous editorial of February 15, this positive statement:

"On the strength of this statement (the Funk statement to Kohlsaatt) the RECORD-HERALD HAS EXPLICITLY STATED SEVERAL TIMES EDITORIALY THAT \$100,000 WAS RAISED TO BUY LORIMER'S ELECTION, and we never have had a protest from anybody on it."

Suppose that Edward Hines or William Lorimer were thus impeached by plain documentary evidence? What would happen? The Chicago Tribune and all of its allies in the crusade to destroy the reputation of Edward Hines and to "drive Lorimer out of politics" would ring with denunciations and accusations. An indictment for perjury would be demanded. It would be asserted that such an exposure damned as false every bit of evidence in favor of their innocence. No type would be too large and no words too severe to picture the mendacity thus exposed.

On February 15, 1911, the day on which Kohlsaatt and Funk swear that the first editorial mentioning \$100,000 or any other sum of money appeared in the Chicago Record-Herald, Kohlsaatt wrote again to Senator Root, and in this letter said:

"The weakness of the anti-Lorimerites is that THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE is back of the fight to unseat Lorimer."

This may be construed to mean that the word of that paper is not to be accepted without question.

On February 10, 1911, five days prior to the appearance of the \$100,000 editorial, Kohlsaats wrote a letter to Senator Cullom, of Illinois, intended to prejudice him against his colleague and friend. I ask the reader to note the character of the paragraph about to be quoted. It makes a direct and unequivocal charge of criminal guilt against Edward Hines, as follows:

"There is absolutely no question that \$100,000 was advanced by Edward Hines and friends to bring about Lorimer's election, as Hines himself told a friend of mine within thirty days after the election that he had a chance to elect Lorimer by putting up that amount, and wanted my friend to partially reimburse the syndicate that underwrote the \$100,000. This information is confidential, but you can take my word for it—IT IS TRUE. . . .

"H. H. KOHLSAAT."

KOHLAAT VS. KOHLAAT.

There is nothing vague about that. Read it again, then read the following, which was written by Kohlsaats to Senator Cullom on February 15, 1911:

"Please do not let the letters and telegrams that Lorimer's friends are bombarding you with swerve you from what your honest old heart must tell you—THAT LORIMER'S SEAT WAS BOUGHT. HINES TOLD THE TRUTH WHEN HE SAID THAT THEY HAD RAISED \$100,000 TO ELECT HIM AND WERE TRYING TO REIMBURSE THEMSELVES. I CAN PROVE THAT TO YOUR SATISFACTION.

"You are 81 years old—poor as a church mouse. When the good Lord calls you, do not leave a single record of winking at corruption, not personally, but in others. If you were to die today the greatest tribute you would receive would be, 'He was absolutely honest.' Don't give occasion to add: 'He made one mistake—he voted to seat a man in the United States Senate knowing he had been elected by the use of money.' Don't mar the record of an absolutely clear title.

"I say this as your friend. Personally, I have no interest in Lorimer, but feel his vindication would be a blow to decency. As ever, your friend,

H. H. KOHLSAAT.

Senator Cullom responded to this plea or threat by voting for Senator Lorimer.

Note that Kohlsaas declares to the aged Senator from Illinois that he can PROVE this awful charge against Edward Hines. He does not ask Senator Cullom to accept his unsubstantiated word—Kohlsaas asserts that "I can prove it to your satisfaction." Let us see about that.

On February 20, 1911, Kohlsaas wrote a letter to Senator W. Murray Crane, of Massachusetts, in which he said:

"There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that \$100,000 was raised to bring about the election. I CANNOT PROVE IT, but have made the assertion editorially several times and have never been challenged for proof.

"H. H. KOHLSAAS."

Kohlsaas gave to Senator Cullom his "word as a man of integrity" that he could prove that Edward Hines was a criminal, and less than a week later wrote or wired to Senator Crane and admitted that he could prove nothing of the kind. Comment should be unnecessary. On February 22 Mr. Kohlsaas again wrote to Senator Crane, and in this communication said:

"There is absolutely no doubt of my friend's statements in these letters, BUT THERE WERE NO WITNESSES NOR ANY WAY OF PROVING THE REQUEST FOR MONEY."

On February 21, Kohlsaas wrote or wired Senator La Follette as follows:

"If I had all the details of the raising and disposition of the \$100,000 I would not have raised the editorial question. That \$100,000 was raised for that purpose I have absolutely no shadow of doubt, BUT CANNOT PROVE. The assertion never has been challenged. You are the first person to ask for particulars.

"H. H. KOHLSAAS."

If Herman H. Kohlsaas should feel impelled to retire from journalism there is a void in the field of humor which he can fill with distinction. He makes a random and criminal charge that \$100,000 had been expended corruptly, brands an honorable man with infamy, and assumes that it must be true because "the assertion never has been challenged." Who would or

could challenge it? The information was then in the exclusive possession of Funk and Kohlsaas. It is rich to hear Kohlsaas chide Senator La Follette: "You are the first person to ask for particulars?" Particulars? Why ask for "particulars"? Was it not enough for La Follette and all the world that Herman H. Kohlsaas gave his word as "a man of integrity" that Edward Hines was a criminal?

Mr. Kohlsaas seems to have forgotten that he once swore that he was in possession of the "particulars" or "details" of this alleged transaction. On March 29, 1911, he gave to the world his first version of the disclosures made to him by Clarence S. Funk. Kohlsaas testified under oath as follows before the Helm Committee:

"Shortly after the Chicago Tribune published Representative White's story last spring I met a friend of mine, a man of the highest character, intelligence, and a man who does not make reckless statements, AND HE GAVE ME A DETAILED ACCOUNT OF THE RAISING OF \$100,000 TO BRING ABOUT THE ELECTION OF MR. LORIMER."

Any authority on the English language will admit that the "giving of a detailed account" implies a narration of the "particulars" of an alleged event. Senator La Follette—if he had read Kohlsaas's sworn testimony before the Helm Committee—was justified in asking the editor for the particulars.

In a study of Mr. Kohlsaas's testimony before the Dillingham Committee we find the following:

MR. MARBLE. "Were you subsequently communicated with by members of the United States Senate in pursuance of that editorial (the Record-Herald editorial of February 15, 1911) who asked you to disclose your information?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Yes."

MR. MARBLE. "By Senators Root and others?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Yes."

MR. MARBLE. "And Senator La Follette?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Yes."

KOHLAAS DESCRIBES HIS CODE.

This gave the committee the plain impression that the curiosity of Senators Root, La Follette and others was aroused by

the editorial in question, also that they had communicated with Kohlsaas. This is brazenly false, as was brought out by later testimony and by the forced production of the Senatorial correspondence. It is doubtful if any member of the Senate ever read or heard of Kohlsaas's editorial until it was offered in evidence at the recent hearings. Senator Root made his speech against Lorimer on February 3—twelve days before the publication of the editorial—and later informed the delighted Kohlsaas that he had largely been influenced by the secret "information" conveyed in that editor's letter—not by any editorial.

The mental, moral and ethical code governing Mr. Kohlsaas in this matter is set forth in his testimony found on page 483 of the official record. He was under cross-examination by Judge Haney:

MR. HANEY. "Do you think it was honorable or fair, as a man, and between man and man, to approach a man in any position who had the deciding of a matter of importance, where so much was involved to Senator Lorimer and his family, and to the State that you live in, the great State of Illinois, and give that individual secretly, so that no defense or explanation of any kind could be made in relation to it by anybody?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "I felt perfectly justified in doing it."

MR. HANEY. "You did?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Yes, sir; as a man and a citizen of Illinois, and a citizen of the United States."

MR. HANEY. "And you think that it would be proper and good morals and honest and fair to besmirch the reputation and the honor of Illinois, its legislature, the honor and reputation and the future of Senator Lorimer, and that of all of his eight children, by giving that information secretly, without opportunity on the part of Senator Lorimer or his family or the State of Illinois to defend against that charge?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Certainly."

MR. HANEY. "Or what might follow it?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Certainly."

MR. HANEY. "And you think that that is the proper code of morals, do you, for any man?"

MR. KOHLSAAS. "Yes, sir."

What a delightful moral code! Prior to that, Mr. Kohlsaas

had enlightened the listening Senators concerning another and most important feature of his moral code.

MR. HANEY. "You knew that they (the members of the Senate of the United States) were sitting as judges in the highest tribunal in the world, from which there was no appeal or review in any way on that question, did you not?"

MR. KOHLSAAT. "I had not thought of it, but that is a good thought."

MR. HANEY. "You knew it, did you not?"

MR. KOHLSAAT. "Yes."

MR. HANEY. "And you knew that you were conveying to these judges and through these judges of that high tribunal information that you wanted to influence their judgment and action, and that they might convey by their personality to other judges sitting in the same tribunal when dealing with this subject matter, did you not?"

MR. KOHLSAAT. "Yes, sir."

MR. HANEY. "And you knew, when conveying that information to them secretly, that the whole future and reputation of Senator Lorimer, the defendant, and that of his family—that ideal family of eight children that you referred to—would be blasted and ruined forever if the information that you conveyed to these judges, and through them to others, was acted upon as you wanted it acted upon, without any opportunity on the part of Senator Lorimer or his family or anybody representing him to know of it or make any defense in relation to it; did you not?"

MR. KOHLSAAT. "Yes, sir."

Returning again to the matter of "particulars" and of the ability of Kohlsaat to furnish them to Senator Root or others, let us see what the record contains. We have learned from Mr. Kohlsaat several things which do not seem in accord with one another. We find Kohlsaat informing the Helm Committee that his friend (Funk) "gave me a detailed account of the raising of \$100,000 to bring about the election of Mr. Lorimer." Then we find him asserting to Senator Cullom that he can prove the guilt of Edward Hines. Then we find Kohlsaat admitting to Senator Crane that he can prove nothing. Let us see what Clarence S. Funk has to say about this. Funk is the original fount of information, "particulars" and "details." We turn to page 601 of the record:

SENATOR FLETCHER. "Mr. Funk, may I ask you whether Mr.

Hines named or indicated in that conversation the contributors to the \$100,000 fund, when, where, and how it was raised, and how it was disbursed?"

MR. FUNK. "He did not. HE WENT INTO NO PARTICULARS."

FUNK HAD NO WITNESSES.

This seems to be fairly conclusive. The difficulty in the way of proving the guilt of Edward Hines—which Kohlsaat once said he could prove and again said he could not prove—is strikingly set forth in the following testimony given by Funk. I refer to page 564:

MR. MARBLE. "Was any other person present at your first conversation with Mr. Hines in the Union League Club, other than you and Mr. Hines?"

MR. FUNK. "No."

MR. MARBLE. "Was any other person present at the time of your second conversation with him when he came to your office?"

MR. FUNK. "No."

MR. MARBLE. "Was any person present at either of your conversations with Mr. McCormick regarding these conversations?"

MR. FUNK. "No."

MR. MARBLE. "Or was any other person present at your conversation with Mr. Bancroft?"

MR. FUNK. "No."

MR. MARBLE. "Or at either of the four conversations with Mr. Kohlsaat which you have repeated—the two on the street relative to the story, the one when he showed you Senator Root's letter, or the final one when you released him?"

MR. FUNK. "No one was present."

MR. MARBLE. "At any of them?"

MR. FUNK. "Two conversations were on the street and two in Mr. Kohlsaat's office."

MR. MARBLE. "And there was no third person present at any of them?"

MR. FUNK. "Nobody else was present."

We are now in a position to view this matter in perspective. The second investigation of the election of Senator Lorimer was precipitated by the secret and public circulation of charges by Herman H. Kohlsaat. These charges rest on the unsubstantiated word of Clarence S. Funk, whose testimony has been shattered by competent witnesses and unanswerable docu-

mentary evidence. Kohlsaatt violated the confidence reposed in him by Funk, testified under oath to a version which Funk later repudiated, disclosed conflicting statements to leading Senators of the United States, stated as provable facts conjectures which he later admitted could not be proved, opened the pages of his newspaper to a flood of vindictive and unfounded rumors, posed before the Helm Committee as a man who would rather go to jail than violate a confidence, and had the satisfaction of precipitating and perpetuating a scandal which has disgraced Illinois and besmirched the reputation of men against whom not one line of criminating evidence has been produced.

A FEW CALM OBSERVATIONS.

Properly weighing my words, I assert in all earnestness my opinion that the attempted blasting of the reputation of Edward Hines is the most dastardly outrage ever perpetrated in the name of a free press. When the truth about Dreyfus was revealed a wave of horror at the outrage and a thrill of sympathy for the victim swept the world. I unhesitatingly declare my opinion that Edward Hines has been wronged as deeply and as unjustly as was the martyr of French conspirators.

I cannot comprehend it. Edward Hines rose from poverty to wealth and position. For more than forty years he has lived in Chicago. During all of those forty years while he was struggling upward he has sustained business and social relations with thousands of men. No word had ever been breathed against his truthfulness or his rigid honesty. He won and retained the respect of those with whom he came in contact. He has occupied places of high honor and vast responsibility. He has never defaulted on an obligation. His domestic life is ideal. His personal habits are exemplary. He is charitable, democratic, kindly by instinct and generous to a fault.

Two years after a purported occurrence a startling charge is made against him. It is not asserted that he committed the alleged offense, but that he boasted of it. No witnesses overheard this boast. It was the word of his accuser against his

denial. Instead of suspending judgment, certain newspapers proclaimed his guilt and held him up to the scorn of the world. No lying rumor was too vile and no invention too absurd for use with flaming headlines.

Edward Hines told under oath the story of his slight identification with the election of Senator Lorimer. No just man can read that testimony and not be convinced of its truth. He fortified it with letters, telegrams, office records and verified proof which established the truth of every statement made by him. His recital of the facts was affirmed by the sworn testimony of such men as Senators Aldrich and Penrose. George M. Reynolds and other men high in political and financial affairs gave testimony which confirmed the essential truth of every important assertion made by Edward Hines under oath. Every concrete fact adduced at the various hearings affirmed his honesty and integrity.

The charge against Edward Hines was improbable on its face. It was more than improbable; it was absurd, childish, silly. It fitted with no established fact. It presupposed that an upright man suddenly became a criminal, without any sane motive for the commission of the alleged felony. It assumed that a trained business man of sound judgment suddenly became an abject idiot. It presupposed that he boasted of a crime which he had no chance to commit, and for which he could expect no reward.

The accusing principal, Clarence S. Funk, offers his unsupported word as the sole substantiation of this weird charge. In all of the months since he formulated it, he has not presented in evidence a scrap of paper, a written or printed document, or any evidence to affirm the truth of his alleged recollections. No witness comes forward to prove that any such interviews ever were held. Funk put the tale in evidence. His business and social associates are called to the stand. They try to recall what Funk told them, and cannot agree with Funk or with one another.

And yet a portion of the press of the nation has followed blindly in the lead of certain papers which have flaunted

every lie and have systematically suppressed the proof which would refute their falsehoods.

If this sort of thing be permitted to go unrebuked, no citizen of Chicago—no matter how honorable his career, no matter how just his conduct—is safe from unwarranted attack and from concerted and malignant abuse.

I call on every fair-minded reader to help undo the terrible wrong which has been inflicted on Edward Hines. In this brief space I have been able to deal with only one feature of the strange campaign which has been waged against a clean and honorable man. I hope to present at an early date a comprehensive review of the facts which have been developed in the official testimony.

I have written the truth as it stands revealed in the certified records of the various investigations which have been held on the Lorimer case. Edward Hines is innocent of the slightest degree of wrongdoing by word, act or intent. I ask every reader to do what he can to restore to Mr. Hines the good name which honestly is his.

ANNOUNCEMENT

At the earliest possible date there will be published in book form a comprehensive history of the astounding conspiracy aimed at Senator William Lorimer, but of which Edward Hines has been the victim. It will expose in detail the successive moves in a plot which has had a far-reaching effect on national politics, and which has cruelly wronged an innocent man.

Frederick Upham Adams has this work in preparation, and those who have read this pamphlet need no assurance that he will do the subject justice.

Those who desire to read this book are requested to mail an application to the Edward Hines Lumber Company, Chicago, Illinois, and a free copy will be forwarded as soon as the book is issued.